

San Jose
Bible College
Library

No. 1507

SAN JOSE BIBLE COLLEGE LIBRARY
790 S. 12th St. P.O. Box 1090
San Jose, California 95108

William Jessup University
Paul Nystrom Library
333 Sunset Blvd.
Rocklin, CA, 95765

15759

THE TRUE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

AS SEEN IN THE

ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION

OF THE

CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA.

EPISCOPAL IN GOVERNMENT; SUCCESSION THROUGH PRESBYTERS; A PRIMITIVE EIRENICON.

BY

REV. MASON GALLAGHER,

Author of "True Churchmanship Vindicated;" "Regard Due to the Virgin Mary;" "Duty and Necessity of Revision;" "The Protestant Episcopacy of the Revolutionary Patriots, Lost and Restored."

INTRODUCTION BY

REV. JOHN McDOWELL LEAVITT, D. D., LL. D.,

Professor of Church History in the Seminary of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Philadelphia.

PUBLISHERS:

FUNK & WAGNALLS,

NEW YORK: 18 & 20 Astor Place.

LONDON: 44 Fleet Street.

TORONTO, CANADA:

WILLIAM BRIGGS.

1890.

COLLEGE LIBRARY

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1890, by
MASON GALLAGHER,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

To Students of Divinity;

THIS VOLUME IS AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED; WITH THE HOPE AND PRAYER THAT IT MAY AID IN ACQUIRING RIGHT AND SOUND VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO A SUBJECT OF GREAT IMPORTANCE; ONE, WHICH IS CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH THE PROGRESS OF THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH; WITH COMFORT IN THE CHRISTIAN FAITH; WITH THE EXTENT OF PERSONAL INFLUENCE; AND, CONSEQUENTLY, WITH THE MEASURE OF SUCCESS IN THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL.

"In the Reformed Episcopal Church we delivered ourselves from the bondage of an unchurching dogma, which compelled us to stand aloof from all fellowship with other branches of Christ's Church, 'holding the Head' and 'the faith once delivered to the saints.'

"We have overleaped these long years of estrangement, of separation, and have gone back to that golden age of Christian brotherhood and inter-communion. We firmly believe that this Reformed Episcopal Church is such a Church as essentially the Edwardian Reformers would have bequeathed to us, if they had been permitted to complete their work.

"A Church claiming no Divine prescription for her Ecclesiastical Polity; an Episcopacy which abjures the pretension of being the Divinely appointed channel for the conveyance of the Holy Ghost in Ordination; a ministry renouncing the name and offices of a Sacerdotal Caste; a Liturgy thoroughly expurgated from all leaven of false teaching, yet holding fast all that was precious in the old.

"Therefore, we believe that this Church of ours is a work in behalf of Christian Union, a step, at least, towards bringing into closer fellowship all the Churches of Protestant Christendom. The great barrier to union among Protestants is the unchurching dogma—while it is cherished and maintained, there can be no reunion of Protestants.

"Let this obstacle be removed. Let these Churches of the Reformation acknowledge, as their fathers did, three centuries ago, that they stand on an equality before God, with diverse polities and administrations, and yet equally owned and blessed of God, parts of one great whole—Christ's witnessing Church—and they are prepared for a closer union, which, though it may not reach to Organic Unity, will cement them into one great army of the Living God, to meet the mighty assault of the hosts of infidelity on one side, and superstition on the other."—Address of Bishop George D. Cummins, to Rev. Dr. A. R. Thompson, Fraternal Delegate of the Reformed Church to Ref. Epis. Council, 1875.

INTRODUCTION.

Ecclesiasticism fails at the test point of its argument. In neither Scripture or history is there proof that the Apostolate was perpetuated in the Episcopate. This is a conclusion of those who draw their inferences not from their facts but their wishes. Ignatius mentions bishops, presbyters and deacons, and from the titles it is supposed that these clergymen were related to each other then as now in the Greek, Latin and Anglican communions. Of this I have never found a trace of evidence.

In monarchic Asia, Episcopal power ripened early, but in free Greece there was certainly no bishop in Corinth, when Clement, first of Apostolic Fathers, wrote his first Epistle. It is reasonable to conclude that as an order, Episcopacy would attain its ambition at different times, according to the genius and circumstances of particular nations.

What was probable as an historic deduction, in Jerome becomes a proved fact. He testifies that bishops and presbyters were one in order, and that the precedence of the former was founded on *custom*, and not on constitution. This general statement he supplements by a particular fact. Jerome informs us that the presbyters of the Church of Alexandria, elected and called their own bishop.

The significance of this statement the Author of this book grasps with great power. His clear vision shows him the importance of the inevitable conclusion. With admirable industry and ability he illustrates the testimony of Jerome, and collects about it the learning of ages. The proof he arrays is not only useful for his argument, but has great value for the information imparted. This book should be in the library of every clergyman and intelligent layman. It adds both to the Author's usefulness and reputation, although already widely and favorably known to the public.

But the subject has another interest. It connects us with the great Church of Alexandria. How wonderful the history of the city!

The Macedonian hero laid its foundations. Here was the seat of the most famous ancient library. Here was a centre of Hebrew and Hellenic culture where the Septuagint had its birth. Afterwards it boasted the greatest Theological School of Christendom, was the home of Clement, and Origen, and the See of the immortal Athanasius. Long the light of Alexandria was brighter than that of Rome, or Constantinople.

JOHN MCDOWELL LEAVITT,

Ref. Epis. Theo. Sem.,
Philadelphia.

"The exclusiveness of the Apostolical Succession lay on me like an iceberg. Its atmosphere was to me a chill. I was forced to admit the orders of the priest who wore his scapular to save him from lust, pestilence and purgatory, and to deny the orders of a Hall, a Storrs, a Simpson and a McCosh. . . . History showed me the Hierarchy ever fostering under its shadow ignorance and servitude! Apostolical Succession and priestly prerogative! You find them together. Priestly usurpations and superstitions are stifling Protestantism in the Anglican Church. I found reform a dream. Nothing was left but to be suppressed, or to withdraw."
Dr. Leavitt's Address, N. Y., Oct. 20, 1889.

We append a few kind words from one who has so greatly adorned the high Office to which, like some of old, he was elected almost by acclamation, and concerning which he has so wisely written.

"I am glad that you have resolved to republish your work on The Church of Alexandria.

New witnesses have arisen. New defenders of the old Faith have drawn their swords, and your own wise arguments re-stated will find later and vigorous endorsement, from strong authority on the other side of the controversy.

Hoping to see the completed work.

I remain faithfully yours,

JOHN H. VINCENT."

"The Original Constitution of the Church of Alexandria, it is scarcely too much to say, is the most important question of Ante-Nicene Christianity." History of the Early Christian Church.

THOMAS WIMBERLY MOSSMAN,
Rector of Torrington, England.

PREFACE TO ENLARGED EDITION.

It will be seen that the present volume is a new edition of a former work, with a supplement, and a modified title. It will be observed moreover, that the writer in the mean time, has changed his Ecclesiastical relations.

The first edition was dedicated to the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church of which the author had been a minister for twenty-four years. It was there stated that "the errors and innovations of the Clerical body portended the disruption of our Church."

Five years after, the disruption feared, occurred. A noble bishop had seen, that by the action of the Legislative Body of his Church, in repeatedly rejecting all remonstrances from those who would stay the progress of Roman and Ritualistic innovations, that there was no hope of reform from within. He had also experienced a series of opprobrious attacks, almost universal, from the Press of his Communion, for

his act in communing at the Lord's table, with ministers and laymen of Non-Episcopal Churches from all Christian countries, at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in 1873.

Here he received grace to take a step, which in moral grandeur and heroism, no Bishop since the Reformation has been enabled to equal, save the Seven Bishops who went to the tower, in their protest against a similar condition of Popery. This godly prelate resigned his diocese, his emoluments, his influence, and his comfort; to go out and to re-establish in this land, the Protestant Episcopal Church, as it was at first constituted by the Heroes of the American Revolution; and as the Bishops of the Revolution of 1689 in England earnestly sought to Reform it.

The deed was fully done, although the effort, with the constant unchristian assaults, and the incessant labors experienced, soon terminated the life of this fearless leader. Still, with the blessing of God, on the courage and sacrifices, and the rare liberality of a few, a truly Protestant Episcopal Church, with a Primitive ministry; a thoroughly Biblical, Evangelical, and

elastic Liturgy; a Democratic constitution suited to a free people; offers itself as a safe and comfortable haven of refuge to those alarmed and disgusted at the inroads of Mediævalism, which has permeated and dominated the dear Church of their childhood. This Reformed Episcopal Church, now completely furnished with a Seminary; a Church Endowment; an earnest, devoted, undaunted band of ministers and laymen; recently at its General Council, declared by vote, its opinion: "This Church recognizes the Episcopate as an OFFICE, but not as an ORDER," thus planting itself on the sure ground of Scripture, and the Primitive Ordinance.

One object of this Volume is to establish by an appeal to history, that the Church of Christ knew no other view, in the first two hundred years of its existence; that a second ordination of a presbyter, who was to possess the sole power of ordination to the ministry, and that by divine appointment, is not narrated by any author of that period, whose works have reached us; that the succession mentioned was either a succession of sound doctrine, or, a succession of men in an office, similar in principle to that

in the case of a Town Supervisor, the incumbent having no more power to hand down his authority to his successors than any other ordinary Supervisor, or, as is seen in the succession of our Presidents.

And this is the whole of it. It is only by misinterpreting or corrupting the language of the early writers, or by a sophistical train of reasoning, or from a superficial view, that anything in the form of a rational or satisfactory plea for the exclusive, continuous, tactual succession theory, with respect to a distinct third order of Bishops by divine right, can be constructed. That the leading lights of all Protestant Churches, of all names and countries, assert the view here maintained is fully shown. Further examination would show that the leading defenders of the opposite, exclusive, hierarchical opinion, have been Bishops, who, contending for the emoluments and powers of their order; unscripturally, unrighteously and gradually, seized upon, appropriated, and held with the connivance of the Imperial authority, from the Presbyters; have necessarily been biassed in

their judgment, and could not be expected to present a true and impartial view of the case.

Hierarchical Domination was forced upon the Church of England in a manner similar to that of old, King James I, arranging with Laud and his subservient bishops, in return for their acknowledgment of the Divine Right of the Monarchy, that they should hold their Episcopal Office by a similar Divine, Exclusive Right. Thus, the rights of the people, and of the presbyters, were similarly disregarded, by the adoption of the aristocratic principle of the Feudal System.

The writer does not expect to influence the minds of those who have been moulded, as it were, in the forms of an exclusive, sacerdotal ritualistic system. The appeal to tradition and custom overrides, in too many of this class, the force of calm, judicial inquiry. We may apply in this case a remark of Mr. Lincoln, made on another subject, "That what had never been reasoned up, could not be reasoned down."

But that some young men, in the Church, in which the writer served as minister for twenty-seven years, may be enabled to study the testi-

mony here presented, and like himself be enabled at length to break through the surrounding mist of ecclesiastical delusion, and see the truth, and thereby derive comfort and peace and power; which cannot come from a false, unreasonable system; this is his hope and prayer, in sending forth these facts of history.

THE OFFER OF AN HISTORIC EPISCOPATE.

Again: the Church from which the writer came, has recently, through its House of Bishops, in the laudable line of Christian unity, presented conditions on which an imagined union may be effected. It presents a so-called Historic Episcopate as the panacea. It offers this blessing on the imperative condition that all Non-Episcopal ministers shall renounce their former orders, supposing they have them, and shall submit to the laying on of the hands of Protestant Episcopal Bishops, and thereby receive for the first time, a valid commission. This is undoubtedly well meant, but will be regarded by some as partaking of a sublime audacity; inasmuch as the parties to receive this divine gift outnumber their proposed benefactors

twenty-five to one; are fully their equals in mind, and attainments; have no question but that they are validly and Scripturally commissioned; are unable to see any connection in the records of history, of an Episcopal succession so-called, with the Primitive constitution of the Christian ministry; and have beheld the Divine Benediction on their labors, poured out as richly and as freely as upon the Protestant Episcopal Church; numerically, in far greater measure.

Were it not that this order of men honestly entertain the idea that they possess this mysterious, undefined spiritual power; that they are accustomed to legislate with closed doors, and possess the prerogative of overriding the unanimously expressed will of a distinct and lower house of Presbyters and laymen far more numerous; a power possessed by no other body of Protestant men in any land; a system thoroughly antagonistic to American Republican ideas; and are necessarily affected by the continuous use and contemplation of these exalted privileges; we never would have witnessed this remarkable offer under such peculiar conditions. Human nature is unfitted for such

claims, and such prerogatives, and therefore the Master said to His disciples, "all ye are brethren, and he that is greatest among you let him be your minister." "For they had a strife among themselves which should be greatest."

When we behold the founders of the so-called Apostolic succession, at the first Communion, in the Master's presence, contending for spiritual domination; is it strange to witness so much of this same Spirit in the Church of after ages?

THE P. E. CHURCH CANNOT CONFER THE IMAGINARY GIFT.

But there is another essential Fact in this connection. If there is such a thing as the Historic Episcopate, and it is of any value, the parties making this offer in the present case cannot deliver the goods.

The Episcopal succession was obtained from England upon the adoption of a specific Constitution and Prayer Book. This Constitution and Prayer Book having been received in England, and approved of, the men elected were thereupon consecrated, in accordance therewith.

Afterwards the principles of that Constitution and Prayer Book were radically changed,

in order to gratify a bishop consecrated in violation of English law by the Non-jurors, who, with all the clergymen who had elected him (for no layman knew aught of this secret conclave), was opposed to Washington, and the Cause for which he and the Continentals struggled and suffered.

One of these radical changes of the original Constitution was in the Fifth Article, where it reads: "the bishop shall be considered a member of the convention ex-officio." Nothing is said of a separate House, and at the first convention after his consecration, there was but one House, and Bishop White was President of it.

After the admission of the High Church Loyalists, in 1789, a separate House of Bishops was formed, with power to negative all acts of the Lower House, unless passed by four-fifths of the body; but as ecclesiastical prerogatives are certain to grow, through the influence of the Divine right sentiment, even this check on the bishops was removed, and an absolute power of veto conferred upon the Body, thus establishing a House of Spiritual Lords. Radical

changes had also been made in the Prayer Book, by a perverted Scoto-Romish Communion Service,* and a thoroughly Sacerdotal Institution Office, appended. The Church thus having radically changed the base on which it received the succession, it follows that they have lost the special gift, if one was conferred. For it has become a Body with principles diverse and antagonistic to those on which it was at first constituted.

But the Reformed Episcopal Church, having returned to the original Constitution and Prayer Book, is re-established upon the same principles upon which the Episcopate was received. Having recovered whatever there was of value in that gift, it alone possesses, and therefore alone can confer it. This subject is considered in a thorough, interesting and valuable volume, "What Do Reformed Episcopalians Believe?" the work of Bishop Charles E. Cheney, D. D., of Chicago, the first Bishop consecrated in the Reformed Episcopal Church.

The writer has spoken with great plainness with respect to the ecclesiastical errors and delusions which he has here combatted. While

he has suffered from being exposed in his years of preparation for the ministry, to the influence of the exclusive sacerdotal system of Archbishop Laud, which has so greatly damaged the Church of Christ, and it has been the effort of years to be rid of these influences; still, his experience has enabled him to learn from an inside view, the full character of this insidious, seductive and blinding scheme. He has undergone with others the distress of an ecclesiastical separation, painful but necessary, the result of this system. In this we follow noble examples.

He deeply regrets that so many worthy Christians will voluntarily remain under an influence ecclesiastically malarious, when it is in their power to enjoy a more healthful and comfortable spiritual region. He has endeavored to show in this volume the causes of the growth of error, and its necessary baleful effects in the Church of God. As a distinguished author remarked of Popery, he believes, that in like manner, Ritualism and Tractarianism, and kindred delusions, "are a poison which a healthful nature may overcome." His earnest desire is that all Christians may know the truth, the

whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that the truth as it is in Jesus, may set them free.

May the Great Head of the Church grant His blessing on this work, and enable it to disseminate Truth, to the advancement of His glory, the good of His Church, and the comfort and usefulness of His children!

An account in full, chronologically, of the changes made in the Prayer Book in England, by the extreme Church party, will be found in a tract, entitled "The Duty and Necessity of Revision;" the departures from the Church of the Revolution, in "The Protestant Episcopacy of the Revolutionary Patriots, Lost and Restored," both by the present writer, and to be obtained at the Reformed Episcopal Publication Rooms, 1604 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

NOTE. As an evidence of the deleterious effects of the influence of the Protestant Episcopal General Theological Seminary, and of the spiritual malaria which environed it; four of the young men who recited in the class of the Author, soon bowed in allegiance before the Pope. Others since have passed through the Institution into the same servitude.

One of these same class-mates said to the writer, with respect to many he had left behind, "They call us Papists. *They* are simply Apists." He preferred the genuine article.

He seemed full of contempt for the nondescript, fantastic system through which he had passed. May the Lord send the light of His Gospel upon all connected with this Institution, and may those who come forth from it, be illuminated to know, and preach simply "the truth as it is in Jesus," unobscured by "the traditions and commandments of men!"

Brooklyn, N. Y.,
June, 1890.

---

* "Ours, now nearly a century in use, contains the Sacerdotal and Sacramental System in full. . . . Retains the form of the Memorial Sacrifice, and asserts the Apostolic Succession. Our office teaches not merely the Real Presence, but also the vital truth, that there is a true Oblation. . . . We have the full Canon with Oblation and Invocation added to the words of Institution and the Manual Acts. We recovered it through the Church of Scotland. . . . The gain over the English Book in that one thing balances all the rest." Rev. Dr. Morgan Dix, Rector of Trinity Ch., N.Y., President of P. E. Gen. Conventions, 1886 and 1889. Lectures on the Book of Common Prayer of 1549.

"Surely, if the salt have not wholly lost its savour, some one in authority, some bishop or prelate will at length arise, and be large-hearted enough to say to his separated brethren of the family of God: There has been enough of strife, enough of division, henceforth let us be one in Christ. We do not ask for your submission, as we have done in the weary ages of controversy that are past. We ask for nothing, we wish for nothing save your unfeigned love. Your ministers we regard as ministers of Christ's, in accordance with their work for Him, though you may not call them by our name; and in you we gladly recognize the work and the fruits of the Spirit of grace, in just as full measure as we behold them among ourselves.

"When this most joyful of days shall come, then shall the family of God be one on earth, even as it is one in heaven; and then shall our Saviour's prayer for the fulfillment of which all loving hearts have ever been sighing, since the spirit of disunion parted them asunder, have its blessed accomplishment—'that they all may be one.'"

MOSSMAN'S PREFACE.

These words written by this large-hearted and accomplished Author, in the year 1873, were destined to meet with their fulfillment, in the action of Bishop Cummins before the close of that same memorable year, when, this godly Minister, at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, received grace and strength, in the interest of Christian Truth and Unity, to sever his ecclesiastical connections, and to found a Church based on the principles so eloquently and lovingly, above presented.

PREFACE.

The principal object of this essay is to show that the Church of England, in publicly acknowledging the validity of a ministry without episcopal ordination or consecration, for more than a century after the Reformation, and in the best period of her history, was sustained by the precedent of the Primitive Church.

The patriarchal Church of Alexandria is here proved to have been episcopal in government, while, at the same time, it was without episcopal consecration or succession for the space of two hundred years immediately succeeding the times of the Apostles.

Ample proof is given that the English Reformers, Compilers, and Revisers of our standards, were cognizant of the fact, and reasoned and acted accordingly.

The concessions of the ablest modern divines of the same Church are here presented. The Church of England is thus fully vindicated with respect to her deliberate action in the premises.

Another important point is hereby established. According to the same primitive precedent, there is in the presbyterate an original, inherent power of perpetuating the ministry in all its functions, and therefore to be exercised when required, in conjunction with the laity, to remove abuses, and to purify the Church.

Again, it will be seen that the doctrine of an indispensable, unbroken episcopal tactual succession, asserted by the Romanists, was rejected by the Reformers and Revisers of our standards; and, moreover, that a large portion of the Primitive Church acted without respect to such a succession.

With the overthrow of this dogma is destroyed the structure of a human, officiating priesthood, with the system of Ritualism based upon it.

The question is one of testimony, not of prejudice or of mere individual opinion. Ample testimony, it is claimed, is here given to establish the statements above made. A candid examination is asked, and little doubt is felt that there

will be but one decision, and that in favor of the positions here maintained.

The falsity of the claim of the Church of Rome to the Primacy; that she is the mother and mistress of churches, is here clearly seen. In position and learning, and consequently in influence, for the two first centuries, this Church was subordinate to the Church of Alexandria. Superiority, neither in learning nor zeal, but in wealth and temporal influence, gave the Church of Rome the precedence, whose kingdom for so many centuries has been manifestly of this world, not of heaven.

Strange is it that the Romish writers cannot agree as to the order of the early bishops of that see; nor can they prove that for two centuries they received episcopal consecration. All such statements being based on assumptions and unfounded inferences, what becomes of that much lauded succession, upon which rests the whole anti-scriptural system of doctrine and worship, by which so large a portion of Christendom has been so long deceived and shrouded in spiritual darkness? The maintenance of the succession dogma by large numbers in our own communion strengthens Romanism by distracting the Protestant cause, and thus promotes schism among

those holding the one scriptural faith, and the true apostolical doctrine.

The argument for the general prevalence of moderate Episcopacy in primitive times is strengthened, not weakened, by the views here presented. With the Episcopacy which approved itself to Cranmer, Jewel, Usher, and Leighton, the writer is fully satisfied. He has seen nothing better in his own day.

The pressing of extravagant claims, supported neither by Scripture, history, reason, or a wise policy, has jeopardized the interests, checked the growth, and sadly impaired the reputation and influence of the truly noble heritage handed down to us by the Protestant Reformers of England.

The effort to extend the system of Archbishop Laud in this free, intelligent land, has proved, as might have been expected, almost a complete failure; and whatever hold our Church has upon the American people, is owing to their conviction, that this system is a false, and not a true presentation of Protestant Episcopacy; that it is ephemeral, and will become, ere long, a discredited novelty.

To any charge of a want of attachment to the

Protestant Episcopal Church, the writer will only point to a service of near a quarter of a century in her ministry. He has no other answer to give.

One of the phenomena of our Church, is the rapidity with which those newly received into our fold (and more than half our ministry have come from other communions) become sounder churchmen, in their own estimation, than many who have labored a lifetime in her service.

A late bishop, in one of our largest and most generally exclusive dioceses, stated to the writer, a few years since, that he had ascertained that but *one fifth* of his clergy had been reared in the Episcopal Church. In a communion so conglomerate, is it strange that there is so little unity, harmony, and mutual cöoperation, or, that men changing their inherited beliefs, and embracing the unscriptural and unreasonable tenets of the modern, exclusive, *jure divino* Episcopacy, should proceed to any extravagance, and even land at the true logical terminus of such a theory, the Church of Rome, the present home of four of the writer's classmates of the General Theological Seminary? The late President Nott has wisely remarked: "Men who go over from one denomination to another always stand up more than

straight, and for two reasons: First, to satisfy their new friends that they have heartily renounced their former error; secondly, to convince their former friends that they had good reasons for desertion."

In view of the state of things in our Church, how singularly applicable are the words of the eminent Dr. Isaac Barrow, as quoted by Dr. Arnold, an equally eminent churchman: "A considerable cause of our divisions hath been the broaching scandalous names, and employing them to blast the reputation of worthy men, bespattering and aspersing them with insinuations, etc.; engines devised by spiteful, and applied by simple people; latitudinarians, rationalists, and I know not what other names intended for reproach, though imparting better signification than those dull detractors can, it seems, discern."

From the fact that, for some time, the writer conscientiously and earnestly advocated the exclusive episcopal theory, he thinks that he enjoys a greater advantage in the discussion of this question. He has surveyed it from more than one direction. He has known by experience the evils of the system against which he is earnestly contending. A somewhat thorough study of the

writings of the English Reformers, compelled him to modify his views, and to adopt the principles of the Compilers of the Prayer Book, in preference to the innovations of Laud and of his followers.

Examination of the writings of the Primitive Fathers has convinced him that the High Church principle was unknown to the Church before the times of Cyprian, two centuries after the death of most of the Apostles.

He has yet to find the statements of an early author, that Primitive Episcopacy was necessarily connected with an episcopal consecration, a second ordination, or an exclusive tactual succession of a third order of the ministry.

Having shown that the most important Church of antiquity, while episcopal in government, with the clearest succession of patriarchs, was yet without episcopal consecration and tactual succession for two centuries, the burden of proof reasonably lies with those who contend that other churches possessed such a tactual and uninterrupted succession, to make clear the fact. It has never yet been done, nor can it be with our present amount of light.

The mere use of the term succession, by writers

like Eusebius, Irenæus, and Tertullian, does not at all settle the question, inasmuch as succession in office and place are not necessarily connected. Dr. Barrow quotes Gregory Nazianzen as saying, "Athanasius was the successor of Mark, no less in piety than in presidency; the which we must suppose to be properly succession." This tactual episcopal succession is assumed by exclusive writers, while no satisfactory proof is furnished.

In a question like this, which concerns the Church standing, and the validity of ministerial acts in the largest portion of the Reformed and Protestant Communions, mere assumptions will not pass current.

The reception of these exclusive assumptions, without satisfactory proof, by Christian people, we believe, as sincere as any, has produced its natural fruits, and made our Episcopacy needlessly repulsive and odious.

Primitive Episcopacy, saddled with these human additions, how it has lost its rightful position!

In the Roman Church, the effect is seen in the almost complete destruction of spiritual religion, and the substitution of an amalgam of Judaism, Paganism, and a corrupted Christianity, whose latest and most favorite dogma, the sinless Con-

ception of the Virgin Mary, has been borrowed from the Koran of Mohammed.

In the Anglican Church, the result has been the repulsion of a large portion of the most religious minds of the nation from its communion. In our own Church, it is seen in the sacrifice of strength and numbers, which might readily have been secured; in a waning influence; in intestine strife; in the increase of formalism; and in the intellectual deterioration of the clerical body. The history of the past, as well as the present condition of affairs, fully establishes these statements, and justifies the position taken by the author; a position taken conscientiously, and with the sincerest regard for the truth and the Church Catholic, and his own branch of the same.

In a succession of apostolical doctrine; in the fact of a ministerial succession; and in a moderate, wise, and safe Episcopacy, he believes with the Reformers; but in the Laudean doctrine of an indispensable, unbroken, episcopal tactual succession, one entirely different from that held by the Christian Fathers, he has no confidence. He has no respect for what has proved to be a destructive and impolitic innovation. He trusts his book may lead others to a full investigation of this error, and to unite with him in resisting

and opposing it, until the whole Church shall combine in rejecting it.

That the legitimate result of the teachings of Cyprian was the papacy, he is fully convinced. That the contest now in the Church is between the principles of Cyprian and those of Luther, he believes, in the words of Isaac Taylor: "It is thus at this moment: Cyprian and Luther are wrestling amain for mastery in the English Church; and one or the other of these spirits must be dislodged. A season of apathy may again come upon the Church, and so the struggle may stand over to another day; but at its next revival, the English Church will either go over unconditionally to antiquity, erasing from its formularies whatever is Protestant in them, and will expel all who adhere to scriptural doctrine; or, it will recover its lost ground, and become consistently Protestant and biblical."

How remarkably has this prediction, uttered in 1843, been verified? We are already in the midst of the renewed conflict. May God speed the right, and give ultimate triumph to a true antiquity? May an open Bible, a free pulpit, an evangelical ministry, prevail over formalism, ritualism, ceremonialism, and ecclesiasticism, and every system akin to Judaism and Popery?

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ACKNOWLEDGES ONE EVANGELICAL MINISTRY 1

CHAPTER II.

THE PATRIARCHAL CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA FURNISHES PRIMITIVE PRECEDENT TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH RESPECT TO THE VALIDITY OF ORDINATIONS IN CHURCHES DESTITUTE OF EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION AND SUCCESSION . 10

CHAPTER III.

NO EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION OR SUCCESSION KNOWN IN THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA FOR MORE THAN TWO CENTURIES AFTER ST. MARK 19

CHAPTER IV.

TESTIMONY OF ENGLISH REFORMERS 24

CHAPTER V.

WRITERS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY 45

CHAPTER VI.

MODERN EPISCOPAL WRITERS 53

CHAPTER VII.

THE ARGUMENT OF AN EPISCOPAL LAYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, WITH RESPECT TO THE ORDINATIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA 68

CHAPTER VIII. PAGE

ROMAN CATHOLIC TESTIMONY 81

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS 84

CHAPTER X.

RECAPITULATION 100

CHAPTER XI.

TESTIMONY FROM NON-EPISCOPAL STANDARD WRITERS . . 107

CHAPTER XII.

SUCCESSION OF SOUND DOCTRINE, THE TRUE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION 167

APPENDIX A.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY 195

APPENDIX B.

CONFIRMATORY EVIDENCE 206

APPENDIX C.

FURTHER LAY TESTIMONY 217

CONTENTS OF SUPPLEMENT.

PAGE

EXAMINATION OF GORE'S OBJECTIONS 237

TESTIMONIES FROM THE METHODIST COMMUNION—WESLEY, COKE, EMORY, PECK 242-9

CONGREGATIONAL AND PRESBYTERIAN TESTIMONY—CONDER, SPARKS, MERRIAM, HALL, HITCHCOCK, FISHER, SMYTH, MILLER, DWIGHT, MASON, BOARDMAN . 249-79

EPISCOPAL TESTIMONY—JACOB, LIGHTFOOT, HATCH, MOSSMAN, GREENWOOD 281-309

A ROMAN CATHOLIC WITNESS—ELLENDORF . . 309-12

DR. WHITTAKER ON JEROME 313

MODERATION OF WHITGIFT 315

SARAVIA ORDAINED BY PRESBYTERS 317

SELDEN'S VERSION OF EUTYCHIUS 319

JEWEL ON JEROME 320

CONTINENTAL CHURCHES AND REFORMERS ON JEROME; LUTHER, CALVIN, CLAUDE, ETC. 321

CONCLUSION—DR. R. B. WELCH ON THE OFFER OF THE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE 332

"They do but abuse themselves and others, who would persuade us that Bishops by Christ's Institution have any Superiority over other men; for we have believed him who told us, that in Jesus Christ there's neither High nor Low, and that in giving honor, *every man should be ready to prefer another before himself;* which saying must certainly cut off all claim to superiority by Title of Christianity, except men can think these things were spoken to poor and private men. Nature and Religion agree in this, that neither of them had a hand in this Heralding of *secundum, sub et supra:* all this comes from Composition and Agreement of men among themselves. . .

"The pursuit of Truth has been my only care ever since I understood the meaning of the word. For this I have forsaken all hopes, all friends, all desires which might bias me, and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have spent my money, my means, my youth, my age, and all that I have. If, with all this cost and pains, my purchase is but error, I may safely say, to err has cost me more than it has many to find the truth: and truth shall give me this testimony at last, that if I have missed of her, it was not my fault, but my misfortune."

"EVER MEMORABLE" JOHN HALES, OF ETON.

THE PRIMITIVE EIRENICON.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ACKNOWLEDGES ONE EVANGELICAL MINISTRY.

It is widely asserted that the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, which are identical in doctrine and government, deny the valid character of orders not conferred by Episcopal bishops. As this charge is a serious one, affecting the scriptural standing of that church, it is important that it should be examined, and if false, be refuted.

History fully vindicates this Church from the charge, and establishes her character as comprehensive and catholic.

The principles of the Church of England were settled by the Reformers, in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, when the Liturgy and Articles were compiled and revised. The action of that Church during this period is the best commentary on the intention of its legislators, and the meaning of their words.

The point to be ascertained in reference to the matter we are considering, is, How did these authorities deal with those who sought to minister in holy things in their Church, but who had been ordained according to the Presbyterian form? Did they acknowledge the valid character of such ordination, or did they not? This is the simple question, and on its answer the whole controversy hinges. History decides this point as it does points with respect to the meaning and intent of the American Constitution. What Washington, Hamilton, and Madison have clearly declared to be the meaning of the latter, we receive: what Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Jewel plainly teach with respect to the meaning of the Episcopal standards, no unprejudiced man will gainsay. It is remarkable, in view of the opinions advanced by many modern Episcopal divines, that for more than a century after the compilation of the Prayer Book, that book was used by ministers not ordained by bishops, who yet were regularly inducted into parishes of the Church of England, and the sacraments administered and all the functions of the ministry exercised by the same, no man forbidding.

The proof we proceed to give, and if conclusive, it settles the question, notwithstanding the assertions of no matter how many modern claimants to the exclusive validity of episcopal orders. The Protestant Episcopal Church may be thor-

oughly comprehensive, while at the same time many Protestant Episcopalians may be exclusive, and stand on a contracted platform.

STRYPE (died 1737).

Strype, the historian, remarks on the act 13th of Elizabeth, "By this the ordinations of the foreign reformed churches were made valid, and those that had no other orders were made the same capacity with others, to *enjoy any place within England*, merely on their subscribing the articles" (vol. ii. p. 514).

(KEBLE.)

Keble, one of the founders of the modern school of Oxford, admits, in his preface to Hooker's works (p. 76), that "nearly up to the time that Hooker wrote (1594), numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than presbyterian ordination."

BISHOP HALL (died 1656).

Bishop Hall (vol. x. 341) writes: "The sticking at the admission of our brethren, returning from foreign reformed churches, was not in the case of ordination, but of institution; they had been acknowledged *ministers of Christ without any other hands laid on them;* but according to the laws of our land, they were not capable of institution to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the

statutes of this realm doth require. And, secondly, I know those, more than one, that by virtue of that ordination, which they have brought with them from other reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings *without any exceptions against the lawfulness of their callings.*"

BISHOP COSIN (died 1672).

Bishop Cosin, in his letter to Cordel, states: — "If at any time, a minister so ordained in these French churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have done of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our bishops did not reordain him to his charge, as they must have done if his former ordination in France had been void; nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and subscribe the articles established" (p. 231, Am. ed.)

BISHOP BURNET (died 1714).

Bishop Burnet, in the "History of his own Times" (vol. i. p. 332), testified that to the year 1662, "those who came to England from the foreign churches, had not been required to be reordained among us." In his "Vindication" (p. 84) he says: "No bishop in Scotland, during my

stay in that kingdom, did so much as desire any of the Presbyterians to be ordained."

BISHOP FLEETWOOD (died 1723).

Bishop Fleetwood, in his works (p. 552), writes of the Church of England: —

"Certainly it was her practice during the reigns of King James and Charles I.; and to the year 1661, we had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefice with cure; and yet were never reordained, but only subscribed the articles."

HALLAM AND MACAULAY.

We close our testimony in the case, with the statement of two modern standard historians. Hallam, in his "Constitutional History" (p. 224), writes: —

"It had not been unusual from the very beginning of the Reformation, to admit ministers, ordained in foreign churches to benefices in England; *no reordination had ever been practiced* with respect to those who had received the imposition of hands in a regular church; and hence it appears that the Church of England, whatever tenet might *latterly* have been broached in controversy, did *not consider the ordinations of presbyters invalid.*"

Macaulay, in his "History" (vol. i. 132), states: — "Episcopal ordination was now (1662), for *the first time*, made an indispensable qualification for preferment."

From the above facts, which cannot be gainsaid, it is clear that the Church of England practically acknowledged for more than a century, in the most open manner, the validity of orders not episcopal, and allowed her members to receive the sacraments, and ministrations of clergymen, without such orders.

We have presented the testimony of seven Church of England bishops, presbyters, and laymen, churchmen of all parties, clearly to the point, that "many ministers" — "more than one" — "numbers," "were instituted into benefices with cures," "enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings," "with the same capacity with others," "were acknowledged ministers," "were never reordained," for "no reordination had ever been practiced with respect to them," "from the very beginnings" of the Reformation in the Church of England.

EDWARD VI.

Moreover, during the same period, a Presbyterian Church composed of foreigners, with a Presbyterian ministry, was placed under the spiritual charge of the Bishop of London, and has thus re-

mained till the present day. The patent granted by Edward VI., 1550, reads, "that by the ministers of the Church of the Germans, and other strangers, a sound interpretation of the most Holy Gospels, and *the administration of the sacraments according to the Word of God and Apostolic customs may exist.*"

If such ministrations be invalid, how can that Church, her officers and rulers, be excused for such dereliction of duty?

In this view of the valid character of the ministrations of the foreign Presbyterian ministers, the King was fully sustained by the venerable Cranmer.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER.

Archbishop Parker, in his "Antiquitates Britannicæ" (p. 580), states: "Archbishop Cranmer, that he might strengthen the evangelical doctrine in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, from which an infinite number of teachers might go forth for the instruction of the whole kingdom, called into England the most celebrated divines of foreign nations: Peter Martyr Vermellius, a Florentine, and Martin Bucer, a German, from Strasburg. The former taught at Oxford, the latter at Cambridge. With the latter, also, Paul Fagius became Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge. And besides these, Immanuel Tremellius, Bernadinus Ochine, Peter Alexander, Volerandus Pol-

ıanus, all of whom, with their wives and children, he maintained. Philip Melancthon and Musculus also were invited."

The author of "Vox Ecclesiæ" excepts to the statement in "True Churchmanship Vindicated," that these men were regarded as "ministers." But Parker continues: "Fagius soon died. The other two, by constant readings, sermons, and disputations, refuted popery and spread the gospel."

In the "Zurich Letters" we find Peter of Perugia writing to Bullinger thus from Cambridge: "Martin Bucer, Bernadine, and Peter Martyr are most actively laboring in their ministry." The Martyr Bradford, — whom of all the Reformers, the Romanists sought most earnestly to pervert to their creed, — in his farewell to Cambridge, exclaims, "Remember the readings and preachings of God's true prophet and preacher, Martin Bucer."

Keble attempts to excuse the English Reformers, on the ground that they were affected by their "personal friendships and political sympathies" with foreigners; that they had given up the argument from "tradition," on which exclusive Episcopacy is based; and that "they wanted the full evidence of the Fathers, with which later generations have been favored," especially a "genuine copy of the works of Ignatius."

To this we reply, that the Reformation divines

were more fully read in the Fathers than our modern theologians, the patristic writings constituting almost the sole Christian literature then extant; that, though they differed essentially with respect to the office of tradition with this Oxford professor, nevertheless, tradition also sustains them in their views, as well as Holy Scripture. On motives of principle, as well as of sympathy and affection, they acted with ecclesiastical moderation, and framed our standards accordingly.

Taking tradition as authority, how could they assert that episcopal orders were alone valid, when a large and important section of the Primitive Church, from apostolic times to the year 250, had neither episcopal consecration nor succession. For, in one of the largest churches of antiquity, simple appointment by presbyters conferred all the rights of the primitive episcopate.

CHAPTER II.

THE PATRIARCHAL CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA FURNISHES PRIMITIVE PRECEDENT TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WITH RESPECT TO THE VALIDITY OF ORDINATIONS IN CHURCHES DESTITUTE OF EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION AND SUCCESSION.

THE portion of the Primitive Church to which we are to look for precedent to sustain the action of the Church of England in acknowledging ordinations without Episcopal succession to be valid is the patriarchal Church of Alexandria.

In order to exhibit the important position of the Church and City of Alexandria, we give the language of a few of our standard writers: —

DR. JOHN LORD.

Professor John Lord, in his recent work, entitled "The Old Roman World," thus writes: "The ground-plan of this great city was traced by Alexander himself; but it was not completed until the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It continued to receive embellishments from nearly every monarch of the Lagian line. Its circumference was about fifteen miles; the streets were regular, and

crossed one another at right angles, and were wide enough to admit both carriages and foot passengers.

"The harbor was large enough to admit the largest fleet ever constructed; its walls and gates were constructed with all the skill and strength known to antiquity; its population numbered six hundred thousand, and all nations were represented in its crowded streets. The wealth of the city may be inferred from the fact that in one year 6,250 talents, or more than $6,000,000, were paid to the public treasury for port dues.

"The library was the largest in the world, and numbered over seven hundred thousand volumes, and this was connected with a museum, a menagerie, a botanical garden, and various halls for lectures, altogether forming the most famous university in the empire.

"The inhabitants were chiefly Greek, and had all their cultivated tastes and mercantile thrift. In a commercial point of view, it was the most important in the empire, and its ships whitened every sea.

"Alexandria was of remarkable beauty, and was called by Ammianus, *vertex omnium civitatum.* Its dry atmosphere preserved for centuries the sharp outlines and gay colors of its buildings, some of which were remarkably imposing.

"The Mausoleum of the Ptolemies, the High Court of Justice, the Stadium, the Gymnasium,

the Palæstra, the Amphitheatre, and the Temple of the Cæsars, called out the admiration of travellers. The Emporium far surpassed the quays of the Tiber. But the most imposing structure was the Exchange, to which for eight hundred years all the nations sent their representatives. It was commerce which made Alexandria so rich and beautiful, and for which it was more distinguished than both Tyre and Carthage. Unlike most commercial cities, it was intellectual; and its schools of poetry, mathematics, medicine, philosophy, and theology, were more renowned than even those of Athens during the third and fourth centuries. For wealth, population, intelligence, and art, it was the second city of the world. It would be a great capital in these times" (pp. 89 90).

DR. WM. S. TYLER.

Professor Tyler, in his fifth article on "Representative Cities," in "Hours at Home," October, 1867, writing of Alexandria, says: "It was the mission of Alexandria to collect manuscripts; to revise editions of the classics; to compose systematic treatises on grammar, geography, and the mathematical and physical sciences; to found libraries and inaugurate universities; to establish an exchange for the intellectual productions and literary wares of distant lands; to criticise and compare the literature of different nations; to

eclecticise, if I may so say, the philosophy of the Orient and the Occident, and even to mediate between the religion of Greeks and barbarians, Jews and Gentiles. In short, to collect whatever was valuable, to select whatever was true and beautiful and good, and to perpetuate whatever was worth preserving; this was the idea, this the aim of Alexandria, though, like all other human aims and ideas, it was imperfectly accomplished. Here the Alexandrian critics corrected and settled the text of Homer, the Bible of the ancient Greeks. Here, also, the seventy translated the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek. Here, also, was the principal catechetical school and theological seminary of the early Christian Church. . . . The birthplace of the eloquent Apollos, the philosophical Clement, the learned Origen, and the theological Athanasius; the traditional place of the martyrdom and burial of the Evangelist Mark, and the probable source of those speculations touching '*the Logos*,' to which the Apostle John alluded in the beginning of his Gospel; it was in Alexandria that Christianity, wedded to philosophy, began to command the respect of the learned, armed herself with new weapons for the defense of the faith, and entered upon a new, and in some respects, a higher field of conflict and triumph. . . .

"Christian Alexandria holds a conspicuous place in Ecclesiastical History. Alexandria gave the

world the Old Testament in Greek, and in this and various other ways contributed largely to form the language of the New Testament — that copious, flexible, and expressive Hellenistic Greek in which the Gospel was earliest and most widely promulgated among the nations. Alexandria enlisted learning and philosophy in the service of religion, and gave to the Church its first theological school, and its most full, definite, and generally accepted creed."

DR. GEORGE HOWE.

Professor George Howe, in his "Bicentenary Discourse on Theological Education," 1844 (p. 69), thus speaks of the Alexandrian Seminary: —

"This school was taught by a succession of men eminent for learning, science, and piety. Among them were Pantænus, Clement, and Origen, men famous while they lived for their talents, learning, and influence.

"The industry of these teachers, and of Origen in particular, was intense. Besides teaching the principal branches of theological study, and the exegesis of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, they added the Grecian literature, and the study of philosophy, and indeed everything which would discipline the minds of the young men, and prepare them the better for a life of Christian activity. Clement says that he had many eminent men as his teachers; one in Greece, who was an

Ionian, another in Magna Grecia; one from Cœlosyria, another from Egypt; others from the East, and of these, one from Assyria, another in Palestine, a Hebrew by descent. The last I met was the first in power: him I found concealed in Egypt, and rested satisfied. He was a true Sicilian bee, gathering the flowers of the Prophetic and Apostolic meadows, who engendered true knowledge in the minds of those who heard him. He thus describes Pantænus, his revered predecessor in the Alexandrian School."

HOSPINIAN.

Hospinian, as quoted by Professor Emerson in his elaborate history of this school, in the "Biblical Repository" (vol. iv. 1834), remarks: —

"Multitudes, renowned for learning and piety, issued forth from it, as from the Trojan horse, and applied themselves to the blessed work of the Lord in the churches of the East."

DR. HASE.

Dr. Hase, in his "Church History" (p. 117), graphically describes the most learned scholars of this most famous university, who succeeded Origen: —

"From the Alexandrian School proceeded those who represented the theology of their century. Athanasius, a didactic rather than an exegetical writer, who ingeniously and enthusiastically re-

duced all Christianity to the simple doctrine of the divinity of Christ; and the three Cappadocians, — Gregory of Nyssa (died about 394), who, next to Origen, was most distinguished for his scientific profundity and originality; his brother Basil, the great metropolitan of Cæsarea (died 379), equally zealous for science and monasticism, but more remarkable for his talents in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs; and the abused friend of his youth, Gregory of Nazianzum (died 390), by inclination and fortune so tossed between the tranquillity of a contemplative life and the storms of ecclesiastical government, that he had no satisfaction in either, — neither a profound thinker nor a poet, but according to the aspirations of his youth an orator, frequently pompous and dry, but laboring as powerfully for the triumph of orthodoxy as for genuine practical Christianity. Next to these were Eusebius of Cæsarea (died 340), whose simple but not artless style was like that of one whose knowledge was abundant, who was fond of peace, and disinclined to the new formulæ of orthodoxy; and blind Didymus (died 395), in spirit and in faith the last faithful follower of Origen."

DEAN STANLEY.

"The most learned body assembled at Nicæa was the Church of Alexandria," writes Dean Stanley, in his "History of the Eastern Church." "The See of Alexandria was then the most im-

portant in the whole Church. Alexandria, till the rise of Constantinople, was the most powerful city in the East. The prestige of its founder still clung to it. The Alexandrian Church was the only great seat of Christian learning. Its episcopate was 'the Evangelical See,' as founded by the Evangelist St. Mark. 'The chair of St. Mark,' was, as it still is, the name of the patriarchal throne of Egypt. Its occupant, as we have seen, was the only potentate of the time who bore the name of 'Pope.' After the Council of Nicæa, he became the 'judge of the world,' from his decisions respecting the celebration of Easter; and the obedience paid to his judgment in all matters of learning, secular and sacred, almost equalled that paid in later days to the ecclesiastical authority of the Popes of the West. The 'head of the Alexandrian Church,' says Gregory Nazianzen, 'is the head of the world.'"

In his own province, his jurisdiction was even more extensive than that of the Roman Pontiff. Not only did he consecrate all the bishops throughout his diocese, but no other bishop had any independent power of ordination (p. 237).

REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM (died 1723).

In his "Antiquities" (vol. i. p. 218), this learned author writes: —

"I must here observe that the Primate of Alexandria was the greatest metropolitan in the world,

both in the absoluteness of his power and the extent of his jurisdiction. For he was not metropolitan of a single province, but of all the provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in which there were at least six large provinces, out of which sometimes above a hundred bishops were called to a provincial council. Alexander summoned near that number to the condemnation of Arius before the Council of Nice. And Athanasius speaks of the same number meeting at other times; particularly the Council of Alexandria, in 339, which heard and justified the cause of Athanasius after his return from banishment, had almost an hundred bishops in it, which was above thirty more than the Bishop of Rome's Libra, which was but sixty-nine. Nor was the Primate of Alexandria's power less than the extent of his jurisdiction; for he not only ordained all his suffragan bishops, but had liberty to ordain presbyters and deacons in all churches throughout the whole district.

"M. Basnage and Launay will have it that he had the sole power of ordaining, and that not so much as a presbyter or deacon could be ordained without him. Valesius thinks his privilege was rather that he might ordain if he pleased, but not that he had the sole power of ordaining presbyters and deacons. But either way it was a great privilege, and peculiar to the Bishop of Alexandria; for no other metropolitan pretended to the like power besides himself."

CHAPTER III.

NO EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION OR SUCCESSION KNOWN IN THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA FOR MORE THAN TWO CENTURIES AFTER ST. MARK.

THE fullest statement we possess with respect to the ordinations in the church at Alexandria is given by Eutychius, patriarch of that see, in the tenth century. The works of this author were translated into Latin, in part, by Selden, 1642, and afterwards in full by Pococke, 1659.

Of this author, Mosheim writes: —

"Among the Arabians no author bears a higher reputation than Eutychius, Bishop of Alexandria, whose annals, with several other productions of his pen, are still extant; who cultivated the sciences of physic and theology with the greatest success, and cast a new light upon them both by his excellent writings."

THE PATRIARCH EUTYCHIUS (Tenth Century).

In giving a history of this, his own see, Eutychius mentions Mark the Evangelist as having appointed Hananias the first patriarch, and then proceeds: —

"Moreover he appointed twelve presbyters with Hananias, who were to remain with the patriarch, so that when the patriarchate was vacant they might elect one of the twelve presbyters, upon whose head the other eleven might place their hands and bless him and create him patriarch, and then choose some excellent man and appoint him presbyter with themselves in the place of him who was thus made patriarch, that thus there might always be twelve. Nor did this custom respecting the presbyters, namely, that they should create their patriarch from the twelve presbyters, cease at Alexandria until the times of Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria, who was of the number of the three hundred and eighteen. But he forbade the presbyters to create the patriarch for the future, and decreed that when the patriarch was dead the bishops should meet together and ordain the patriarch. Thus, that ancient custom, by which the patriarch used to be created by the presbyters, disappeared, and in its place succeeded the ordinance for the creation of the patriarch by the bishops."

George Elmacinus, a later Egyptian writer, whose works were translated by Erpenius, confirms this testimony of Eutychius. We have, however, the confirmation of his statements by more ancient writers.

SEVERUS (Tenth Century).

Severus, as quoted by Renaudot, both historians of the patriarchs of Alexandria, states that after the death of Theonas "the priests and people were collected together at Alexandria, and laid their hands on Peter, his son in the faith, and disciple, a priest, and placed him in the patriarchal throne of Alexandria, according to the command of Theonas, in the tenth year of the Emperor Diocletian."

HILARY, OR AMBROSE (Fourth Century).

The author of a commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, by some supposed to be Hilary, and by others Ambrose, both of the fourth century, on Ephesians iv. 2, writes: —

"The Apostle calls Timothy, created by him a presbyter, a bishop (for the first presbyters were called bishops), that when he departed the one next to him might succeed him. Moreover, in Egypt the presbyters (*consignant*) confirm, if a bishop be not present."

A CONTEMPORARY.

Another author, whose works are printed with those of St. Augustine, and supposed to be his contemporary, says: —

"In Alexandria, and through the whole of Egypt, if there is no bishop, a presbyter consecrates."

ST. JEROME (Fourth Century).

The most important witness, however, one born within the century succeeding, is St. Jerome, confessedly the most learned of the ancients, who in his Epistle to Evangelus, after quoting passages of Scripture, to show that bishops and presbyters, as to their sacerdotal character, are the same, remarks: —

"But that afterwards one was chosen to be over the rest; this was done to prevent schism, lest each one drawing the Church after him should break it up. For at Alexandria, also, from Mark the Evangelist to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always called one elected among themselves, and placed in a higher rank, their bishop; just as an army may constitute its general, or deacons may elect one of themselves, whom they know to be diligent, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop do, with the exception of ordination, which a presbyter may not do?"

It is well known that Jerome teaches the same origin for Episcopacy, in his commentary on Titus i. 5, where he says: —

"As the presbyters, therefore, know that they are subject by the custom of the Church to him who is placed over them, so let bishops know that they are greater than presbyters more by custom than by any real appointment of the

Lord, and that they ought to govern the Church along with the presbyters," etc.

Such is the testimony of antiquity in regard to the ordinations in the patriarchate of Alexandria in the times immediately succeeding the Apostles.

Do we ever read of the validity of the ministry of the Church of Alexandria as denied by the rest of the Primitive Church? If not, then is the Church of England sustained in her course in this respect by primitive precedent, and those who deny the validity of presbyterian orders, impugn the action of this Church, and of the Primitive Church likewise. Their theory is a modern innovation.

CHAPTER IV.

TESTIMONY OF ENGLISH REFORMERS.

THIS custom of the Church of Alexandria was well known to the English Reformers and Revisers, and is conceded by the ablest modern writers.

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT (died 1604).

This writer, in his "Answer to the Admonition" of Cartwright, which was revised and approved by Archbishop Parker, Bishops Cox, Cooper, and others, and according to Strype, "may be esteemed and applied to as one of the public books of the Church of England concerning her profession and principles, and as being of the like authority in respect to its worship and government, in opposition to the Disciplinarians, as Bishop Jewel's 'Apology and Defense,' in respect to the Reformation and doctrine of it, in opposition to the Papists," while contending for the primitive origin of Episcopacy, does not deny the statements of Jerome with regard to Alexandria. They were familiar to his mind, as they were to all the divines of that period. In vol. ii. p. 222, he writes: —

"The same Hierome, in his 'Epistles *ad Evag.*,' teacheth that the cause that one was chosen among the bishops to rule over the rest was to meet with schisms, lest every one according to his own fancy should tear in pieces the Church of Christ; and says farther, that in Alexandria," etc. He then quotes the passage referred to.

Vol. ii. p. 251, Whitgift writes: —

"Every bishop is a priest, but every priest hath not the name and title of a bishop, in that meaning that Jerome in this place taketh the name of bishop. For his words be these: 'In Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist,' etc. . . . 'Neither shall you find this word *episcopus* commonly used but for that priest that is in degree over and above the rest, notwithstanding *episcopus* be oftentimes called *presbyter*, because *presbyter* is the more general name,'" etc.

As this combined testimony of Whitgift, Parker, Cox, Cooper, and others, is of such value, we give further extracts: —

"It is plain that any one certain form or kind of external government, perpetually to be observed, is nowhere in the Scripture prescribed to the Church. . . . This is the opinion of the best writers; neither do I know any learned man of a contrary judgment." — *Whitgift* (vol. iii. p. 215).

"One church is not bound of necessity in all things to follow another; only the Church of Rome is so arrogant and proud to challenge that prerogative" (p. 317).

"The doctrine taught and professed by our bishops at this day is much more perfect, and sounder than it commonly was in any age after the Apostles' time" (ii. p. 471).

What Whitgift, Parker, Cox, and Cooper thought of the "*Via Media*" may here be learned. When Cartwright charged the Church of England with a closer agreement with the Papists than with the Reformed churches, Whitgift replied, —

"Wherein do we agree with the Papists? or wherein do we differ from the Reformed churches? With these we have all points of doctrine and substance common; from the other we dissent, in the most part both of doctrine and ceremonies. From what spirit come these bold and untrue speeches?" (vol. ii. p. 472.)

"Beware of an ambitious morosity, and take heed of a new popedom. . . . You may not bind us to follow any particular church, neither ought you to consent to any such new servitude" (p. 454).

BULLINGER'S "DECADES."

We give an extract from the "Decades" of this learned foreigner, inasmuch as his writings were indorsed by Archbishop Whitgift. There may not have been an entire agreement between the two authors on all points concerning church government, but, at the same time, what modern exclusive Episcopal writer would have commended

the "Decades" to the study of the clergy, without reservation? We have in this act of Whitgift an evidence of the confidence entertained by the English Divines in their Continental co-workers.

Henry Bullinger was preacher of the Cathedral of Zurich from 1531 to 1574. He entertained the English exiles under Mary. Such was his influence that he was appealed to as umpire in the Vestiarian controversy; and his decision, that the use of vestments was scriptural and proper, went far to settle the question.

Whitgift, in 1586, issued the following archiepiscopal order: —

"Every minister having cure . . . shall, before the second day of February next, provide a Bible, and Bullinger's 'Decades' in Latin or English, and a paper book, and shall every day read over one chapter of the Holy Scriptures, and note the principal contents thereof in his paper book, and shall every week read over one sermon in said 'Decades,' and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in said paper."

Bullinger, in his fifth Decade, third sermon, writes: —

"But in the order of bishops and elders from the beginning there was singular humility, charity, and concord; no contention, no strife for prerogative, or titles, or dignity; for all acknowledged themselves to be ministers of one Master, coequal in all things touching office or charge. He made

them unequal not in office, but in gifts, by the excellency of gifts. . . . In process of time all things of ancient soundness, humility, and simplicity vanished away; while some things are turned upside down: some things either of their own accord were out of use, or else were taken away by deceit: some things are added to. Verily not many ages after the death of the Apostles there was seen a far other hierarchy (or government) of the Church than was from the beginning; although those beginnings seem to be more tolerable than at this day all of this same order are. St. Hierome saith, 'In time past churches were governed with the common council and advice of the elders: afterward it was decreed that one of the elders, being chosen, should be set over the others: unto whom the whole care of the Church should pertain, and that the seeds of schism should be taken away.' Thus much he: In every city and country, therefore, he that was most excellent was placed above the rest. His office was to be superintendent, and to have the oversight of the minister, and of the whole flock. He had not (as we even now understand out of Cyprian's words) dominion over his fellows in office, or other elders; but, as the Consul in the Senate-house was placed to demand and gather together the voices of the Senators, and to defend the laws and privileges, and to be careful lest there should arise factions among the Sena-

tors, even so no other was the office of a bishop in the Church; in all other things he was but equal with the other ministers. But had not the arrogancy of the ministers and ambition of the bishops in the times that followed further increased, we would not further speak against them. And St. Hierome affirmeth that 'That preferment of bishops sprang not by God's ordinance, but by the ordinance of men.'"

In the second sermon, Bullinger states:—

"St. Hierome judgeth rightly, saying, that by the custom of man, and not by the authority of God, some one of the elders should be placed over the rest, and called a bishop; whereas of old time an elder or minister and a bishop were of equal honor, power, and dignity."

He then refers to the letter to Evangelus in which Jerome alludes to the Church of Alexandria.

If Whitgift had regarded episcopal government as essential to the existence of a church, he would, reasonably, have guarded his readers against the statements of Bullinger on this point, just as the American House of Bishops, when recommending "Doddridge's Commentary" to the perusal of candidates for orders, directed attention at the same time to this author's different view with respect to church government.

DR. JOHN RAINOLDS.

There is a striking similarity in the statement of Bullinger, to that given by Dr. Rainolds, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, as to the origin of Episcopacy.

Archbishop Usher presented it to the public in 1641, in a Tract entitled, "The Judgment of Dr. Rainolds, touching the Original of Episcopacy, more largely confirmed out of Antiquity." As both Rainolds and Usher had read all the Fathers, and were respectively esteemed the most learned men of their times, we have no account of this matter to which credence can be more implicitly given. What Augustine said of Jerome, may be justly applied to these profound scholars: "What they were ignorant of, no man knew." The following is Rainolds' statement: —

"Presbyters were constituted bishops by the Holy Ghost, that they might superintend and feed the flock; and that this might be more effectually accomplished by their united counsel and consent, they were accustomed to meet together in one company, and to elect one as president of the assembly, and moderator of the proceedings; whom Christ in the Revelation denominates the angel of the church, and to whom he writes those things which he meant him to signify to the others. And this is the person whom the Fathers afterwards, in the Primitive Church, denominated the bishop." (Conference, ad Hart,

cap. iv. p. 47). The tract may be found in Usher's Works, vol. v. p. 75. In this connection we give the important letter of Dr. Rainolds to Sir Francis Knollys, Lord Treasurer of England, who wrote to inquire whether Dr. Bancroft was right when he asserted, at St. Paul's Cross, "that bishops were superior governors over their brethren, by God's ordinance, *i. e.*, *jure divino?*" To this Rainolds replied, in what is the oldest defense on record of moderate primitive Episcopacy, against its first Protestant High Church champion (though Bancroft was far from holding the prevalent exclusive view): "It is one thing to say that there ought to be no difference between them," etc., . . . "another thing to say that by *the Word of God* there is no difference betwixt them but by the order and custom of the Church," which St. Austin saith in effect himself. . . .

"When Harding, the Papist, alleged these very witnesses to prove the opinion of bishops and priests being the same, according to Scripture, to be heresy, our learned countryman of good memory, Bishop Jewel, cited to the contrary Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, and St. Austin himself, concluding his answer with these words: "All these and other more holy fathers, with St. Paul, for thus saying, by Harding's advice, must be held for heretics."

"Michael Medina, a man of great account in the Council of Trent, more ingenuous therein than

many other Papists, affirmed not only the former ancient writers alleged by Bishop Jewel, but also another Jerome, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, Theophylact, who were of the same mind, . . . with whom agree likewise Œcumenius, and Anselmus, Archbishop of Canterbury, and another Anselmus, and Gregory, and Gratian, and after them how many, it being once enrolled in the canon law for sound and Catholic doctrine, and thereupon taught publicly by learned men, all which do bear witness against Dr. Bancroft of the point in question, that it was not condemned for a heresy by the general consent of the whole Church. . . . Whereto it may be added, that they also who have labored about the reforming of the Church, these five hundred years, have taught that all pastors, be they entitled bishops or priests, have equal authority and power by God's Word. First, the Waldenses, next Massilius Patavinus, then Wickliffe and his scholars, afterwards Huss; last of all Luther, Calvin, Brentius, Bullinger, Musculus, and others, who might be reckoned particularly in great number such as were with us; both Bishops Jewel and Pilkington, and the Queen's Professors of Divinity in our Universities, Drs. Humphrey and Whittaker, and other learned men. Bradford, Lambert, Fox, and Fulke, do consent therein; so in foreign nations all whom I have read treating of this matter, and many more whom I have not read.

"But why do I speak of particular persons? It is the common judgment of the Reformed Churches of Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries, and *our own*. I hope Dr. Bancroft will not say that all these have approved that for sound doctrine which was condemned by the general consent of the whole Church for heresy in a most flourishing time. I hope he will acknowledge that he was overseen when he avouched the superiority which bishops have among us over the clergy to be God's own ordinance."

This testimony of Rainolds, to a point congenial to the one under consideration, it would seem were conclusive as to the view of the Church of England with respect to the origin of Episcopacy. The only reply which is given, is that "Rainolds was a Puritan." A strict conformist to the Church of England all his days, and in his last hours a recipient of the Communion according to its rites, Rainolds was selected by King James to present the demands of the Reforming party of the Church. The changes he desired were mainly those made by Bishop White in our American Prayer-Book. To an impartial student no Christian name in history is more worthy than this divine, who could not be tempted by an episcopate offered him by his sovereign; who was long the revered instructor of the English clergy, and honored in being the tutor of Richard Hooker;

a man who, far in advance of his age, sought by moderate counsels to avert the coming storm, and whose last legacy to the Church was the standard English version of the Bible, made by his monarch at his earnest request. The soul of this true evangelical churchman went to its reward while appropriately engaged in the preparation of this greatest surviving monument of the Reformation.

DR. ANDREW WILLET (died 1621).

This writer, for his acquirements, was called "a miracle of learning." He was chaplain to Prince Henry and Prebend of Ely. Bishop Hall includes him among the clergy of England, who were "the world's wonder." His greatest work is the "*Synopsis Papismi.*"

This work, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, and afterward to James I., passed through five editions under the royal license. In 1634 an edition was issued "by the authority of His Majesty's royal letters-patent," which state "that it hath been seen and allowed by the Lords the Reverend Bishops, and hath also ever since been in great esteem in both Universities; and also much desired by all the learned, both of our clergy and laity, throughout our dominions." From this important work we quote largely. Vol. iii. p. 58, Dr. Willet writes: "To the ecclesiastical policy in the advancing of the dignity of the bishops these things (of human appointment) do

pertain. First of all, St. Hierome saith of confirmation committed only to bishops, 'Know that this observation is rather for the honor of their priesthood than by the necessity of any law.'

"Secondly, the Council of Aquisgrane (cap. 8) saith, that the ordination and consecration of ministers is now reserved to the chief minister only for authority's sake.

"Fourthly, the jurisdiction of the Church, which, in time past, Hierome saith, was committed to the Senate or College of Presbyters, was afterwards, to avoid schism, devolved to the Bishop. And of this Senate mention is made in the Decrees. St. Hierome saith: "At Alexandria, from the Evangelist Mark, down to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always gave the name of bishop to one whom they elected from themselves, and placed in a higher degree; in the same way as an army may create its general, or the deacons should choose an industrious man whom they make their archdeacon. (Hierome ad Evang.) *So it should seem that the very election of a bishop in those days, without any other circumstances, was his ordination.*"

Speaking of the Greek Church, on p. 72, he writes: "Though they yielded the supremacy to the bishop as the chief, yet the presbyters were joined with them in the regiment of the Church; the sole administration of the keys was not in the

bishop. The same, also, was the custom of the South Church, as Jerome writeth, how in Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist unto Heraclas and Dionysius, 'The presbyters did call one chosen from amongst them, and placed in an higher degree their bishop.' (Hierome ad Evang.) By the which it appeareth, that the College of the Presbyters did elect and choose their bishop, and he was a prime man among them; but the other were not excluded. Ambrose testifieth as much of the custom of the Egyptian Church: 'The first presbyters were called bishops, and the first removing, the next succeeded. In Egypt the presbyters, the bishop not being present, did confirm; but because the next presbyters were found unworthy to hold the primacy or first place, the manner was changed by the provision of a council, that not order, but merit and worthiness should make a bishop' (in 4th ad Ephes.). It seemeth then that the custom of the Egyptian Church at the first was to make the bishop only the prime or first man of the presbytery; the change that followed was by synodical constitutions. And some evidence yet remaineth of that ancient ecclesiastical government to this day in the Ethiopic Church, where the patriarch hath always twelve ecclesiastical persons his assistants, with whom he communicateth touching ecclesiastical affairs."

Dr. Willet, on p. 53, quotes St. Ambrose as say-

ing: "He doth place the ordination of deacon after a bishop. Why? Because there is one ordination of a bishop and a priest, for both of them is a minister, yet the Bishop is first among the priests."

"St. Chrysostom useth the same reason: 'There is almost no difference between a bishop and a priest, because that unto priests the care of the Church is committed, and that which the Apostle said of bishops doth agree unto priests.'"

Page 47, he writes: "I come now to deliver our own opinion. . . . . The distinction of bishops and priests, as it is now received, cannot be directly proved out of Scripture; yet it is very necessary for the policy of the Church to avoid schism, and to preserve it in unity. Of this judgment, Bishop Jewel against Harding, showeth both Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Jerome to have been (Defens. Apolg. p. 248). And amongst the rest, St. Jerome thus writeth: 'That the Apostle teacheth, evidently, that bishops and priests were the same. Yet he holdeth this distinction to be necessary for the government of the Church. That one afterward was chosen to be set over the rest; it was done to be a remedy against schism' (ad Evang.). To this opinion, St. Jerome subscribeth — Bishop Jewel in the place before quoted, and another most reverend prelate of our Church, (Bishop Whitgift) — in these words: 'I know these names to be confounded in the Scriptures,

but I speak according to the manner and custom of the Church ever since the Apostles' time' (Defen. Answ. Admonit., p. 383). Which saying is agreeable to that of St. Augustine (Epist. xix. ad Hieron.): 'According to the names of honor, which the use or custom of the Church hath obtained, a bishop is greater than a priest.' So that Augustine himself, who was no Arian, doth found this distinction rather upon ancient custom than Scripture." Page 52, "Michael Medina, a Papist, thinketh that both Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, were in the same heresy with Arius. It may easily be disproved. Firstly, seeing Augustine with the rest held Arius to be a heretic, how could they condemn that for heresy in another which they themselves maintained? Secondly, it is not like that the Church, which had condemned that for heresy in Arius, would tolerate it in the rest. Thirdly, there is great difference between Arius' opinion and theirs, for he would have no difference at all between a bishop and a priest. The Fathers allowed a difference, holding it to be profitable for the peace of the Church; they only affirmed, that this distinction was rather authorized by the ancient practice of the Church, than by any direct place of Scripture."

We have here the testimony of Dr. Willet with respect to the view of the Church of England in regard to episcopal ordination ("our own opinion"), as he terms it, expressed with the approval

of Elizabeth and James, and of the bishops and universities of England. He quotes, as sustaining the same opinion, Bishop Jewel's "Apology," a standard authority, and also Bishop Whitgift's "Answer to the Admonition," making the assertion during the lifetime of the latter author. As no other writer has discoursed more clearly, and more ably on these topics which so deeply concern the peace of all churches, than Dr. Willet, in his "Synopsis," we give another quotation from p. 55: "Although it cannot be denied but that the government of bishops, according to the use of the primitive Church, is very profitable for the preserving of unity, yet dare we not condemn the churches of Geneva, Helvetia, Germany, and Scotland, that have received another form of ecclesiastical government, as the Papists proudly affirm all churches which have not such bishops as theirs are, to be no churches. Wherefore I cannot conclude that this special form of ecclesiastical government is absolutely prescribed in the Word; for then all those churches which have not that prescript form, whether of bishops or others, should be condemned as erroneous churches. So then here is the difference between our adversaries the Papists and us. They say that it is of necessity to salvation to be subject to the Pope, and to bishops and archbishops under him, as necessarily prescribed in the Word; but so do not our bishops and archbishops, which is

a notable difference between the bishops of the popish church and of the Reformed Churches. (Defens. Answ. Admonition, p. 382).

"Wherefore, as we condemn not those Reformed Churches which have retained another form of ecclesiastical government, so neither are they to censure our Church, for holding still the ancient regiment of bishops, purged from the ambitious and superstitious inventions of the popish prelacy. Let every church use that form which best fitteth their state; in external matters every church is free, not one bound to the prescription of another, so they measure themselves by the will of the Word, for if any church shall seem to prescribe unto another in those things wherein they are left free, that saying of the Apostle may be fitly applied against them (1 Cor. xiv. 36), 'Did the Word of God spring from you, or came it unto you only?' God may give unto one church wisdom out of the Word, to know what is best for their state, as well as to another. And so I conclude this point with that saying of St. Augustine to the Donatist bishops: 'Hold that which you hold: you have your sheep, I have my sheep; be not troublesome to my sheep, I am not troublesome to yours' (Exposit. 2, in Psal. xxi.). So may we say to our sisters, the Reformed Churches, and they likewise to us: Let them hold that government they have; we do not molest them in their course, neither let them molest us in ours."

As we are defending in this work the practice of the Church of England for one hundred years, in allowing the validity of presbyterian ordination, we may be excused if we quote further from this work of Dr. Willet, which has the imprimatur of the sovereign heads of the Church of England, the bishops and the universities, and which has more fully and satisfactorily treated of this subject than any other work of that period.

Volume vi. p. 368, Dr. Willet writes: "As the one hundred and eleventh error, the Papists hold that they are neither priests nor deacons which are not ordained of bishops. Neither is it true that there are no ministers but by the ordination of bishops, for this were to condemn all those Reformed Churches of Helvetia, Belgia, Geneva, with others which have not received the form of ecclesiastical government. Undoubtedly where godly bishops are, there no ordination is to be had without them, as in the Church of England; but every church having not the same office, but others equivalent or correspondent thereunto, hath full authority in itself to ordain ministers in such order and manner as the Church hath received, agreeable to the Word of God. So that we doubt not but that all the Reformed Churches professing the gospel have true and lawful ministers, though they observe not all the same manner in the election and ordaining them. And this is the general consent of the churches themselves."

He then quotes, among others, the "Anglican Confession:" "We say that the minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the Church of God." It may be remarked here that in these words we have an authorized interpretation of the Nineteenth Article.

"This, then, is the judgment of the Reformed Churches, — that every church is not tied to the same manner of ordination of ministers, so that it be agreeable to the Word of God; but according to this rule every church may make choice of that form and order which is most agreeable to their state, so that when the calling of bishops is received, by them ministers must enter; where there are none, the calling of the church must be followed. Our arguments and reasons are these:

"First, out of Scripture, Acts xiii. 3, certain prophets and teachers at Antioch lay hands upon Paul and Barnabas. The Rhemists gather hereupon "that they were ordered, admitted, and consecrated by them." Annot. in *hunc locum* (which we say not, but they were only sent out to the execution of their office, being before chosen of the Spirit); but hence it followeth, that as at Antioch, there being no Apostles, but only prophets and teachers, to lay hands upon Paul, the rest did it; so those churches where there are no bishops, the right of ordaining ministers may be executed by others lawfully appointed of the Church.

"If this were not so, these inconveniences

would ensue: Firstly, that all these Reformed Churches should have no true ministers, being without episcopal ordination. Secondly, that they must either be denied to be churches, or else a true church may be without the power of ordination, which is in nowise to be granted. Thirdly, that those excellent men, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, with others, extraordinarily raised up of God for the propagation of the Gospel, should not have been true ministers because they entered not by that ordination."

On p. 376, quoting again from Jerome, he adds: "To this it is further added by a reverend learned man, now a bishop of our Church; so at length by custom presbyters were utterly excluded from all advice and counsel, whereof Ambrose complaineth, and bishops only intermeddled with the regiment of the Church. This manner of subjection in presbyters, and prelation in bishops, grew only in continuance of time, and not by any ordinance of Christ or his Apostles. See more of this matter on difference of ministers." This we have before presented.

Thus we may see plainly and unmistakably, what was the view of the Church of England on the point of ordination, down to the year 1634, the very year in which Archbishop Laud, first of Protestants, broke the unity of the Church by requesting the English Ambassador at Paris to withdraw from the Presbyterian ministrations.

For, previous to this event, intercommunion between all the Protestant bodies was on terms of entire equality, with no disturbance on the point of church government. This was clearly established at the Synod of Dort, 1618, by the reception of the Holy Communion by Bishop Carleton, Drs. Hall, Davenant, and Ward, of the Church of England, in common with the rest of the deputies, at the hands of Dr. Bogermann, the Presbyterian moderator. "There is no place on earth like the Synod of Dort; no place where I should so much like to dwell," said Dr. Hall, afterwards the distinguished Bishop of Norwich. Willet's "Synopsis," which is sustained by the statements of Jewel's "Apology," and Whitgift's "Answer," establishes clearly the moderate and Catholic principles of the Church of England. Thus the doctrine and the practice of this Church are seen to be in full accordance with each other, as both were consonant with the principles and practice of the Primitive Church.

CHAPTER V.

WRITERS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

We have given proof that the revisers of the standards of the Church of England under Elizabeth and her most prominent divines, were acquainted with the historical fact that the Church of Alexandria, while maintaining episcopal government, was without episcopal consecration and succession for two centuries, from the time of its founder, Mark the Evangelist. This Church, following primitive customs, allowed such ordination to be valid.

To strengthen our position, we proceed to give the concessions of distinguished later divines — *two* of the seventeenth and four of the present century.

ARCHBISHOP USHER (died 1655).

For the first half of the seventeenth century we present Archbishop Usher as a witness of the views of the divines of that period, himself confessedly the most learned of them all. As a man who had read all the fathers, Greek and Latin, Usher could not fail to be acquainted with the facts here

made prominent. Richard Baxter, in his "Life" (p. 206), writes of Usher: "I asked him also, in his judgment, about the validity of presbyterian ordination, which he asserted, and told me that the king asked him, at the Isle of Wight, 'where he found in antiquity that presbyters alone ordained any.' And that he answered, 'I can show your majesty more even, where presbyters alone successively ordained bishops,' and instanced in Hierome's words, Epist. ad Evagrium, of the presbyters of Alexandria choosing and making their own bishop, from the days of Mark to Heraclas and Dionysius."

Usher, it is well known, held that the bishops differed from the presbyters, not in *order*, but simply in *degree*. "The intrinsical power of ordaining," he writes, "proceedeth not from jurisdiction, but only from order. But a presbyter hath the same order *in specie* with a bishop. *Ergo*, a presbyter hath equally an intrinsical power to give orders, and is equal to him in the power of order; the bishop having no higher degree in respect of retention or extension of the character of orders, though he hath a higher degree, *i. e.* a more eminent place in respect of authority and jurisdiction and spiritual regimen." Appendix to "Parr's Life," p. 6, ed. 1686. "The Lord Primate was always of this opinion," says Parr. He quotes him as saying: "Howsoever, I must needs think that the churches which have

no bishops are thereby become very much defective in their government, and that the churches in France, who, living under a Popish power, cannot do what they would, are more excusable in this defect than the Low Countries, that live under a free State. Yet, for the testifying my communion with these churches (which I do love and honor as true members of the Church universal), I do profess that, with like affection, I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers, if I were in Charenton."

This language is the more important to our purpose, inasmuch as but recently, in 1634, Archbishop Laud, the father of exclusive Episcopacy, had desired the English Ambassador to France not to attend the preaching and sacraments of the Presbyterian ministers at Charenton, on the ground that they had no valid ordination.

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET (died 1699).

We pass now to the testimony of one of the most distinguished divines of the latter half of the same century, Bishop Stillingfleet, about whom there has been as much controversy as concerning any divine of his Church. The testimony of Stillingfleet is the more forcible, as he belongs to that class of Episcopalians, who, led astray from their early moderation, have adopted

more stringent views of Episcopacy in after life. Stillingfleet, however, like many others, on further reflection, returned to the comprehensive views he had so ably presented in his "Irenicum." Stillingfleet, after he was made dean, in 1680, used strong language towards the non-conformists, and advanced higher claims for Episcopacy, and intimated that he would not then have made all the concessions which he had advanced in his "Irenicum," written in 1662. He wrote, however, in the heat of a most violent controversy — "that age of fierce and savage controversy, of the tomahawk and scalping-knife," as Rogers terms it.

In the last years of his life, Stillingfleet revised, and endorsed entire, Bishop Burnet's work on "The Articles," a work most obnoxious to exclusive churchmen, wherein the author asserts, "Whatsoever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of the Church, half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches, so constituted to be true Churches as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And, therefore, the general words in which this part of the Article (23d) is penned, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them." This language Stillingfleet fully endorsed.

Ten years previous, he united with Tillotson, Tennison, Patrick, and others, in an earnest attempt for a comprehension of dissenters, and one of the conditions of the plan was that "foreign Presbyterian ministers should be received without reordination." Birch, in his "Life of Tillotson," gives the particulars. The arrangement was defeated by the bigotry and intolerance of the lower House of Convocation; in consequence, England has presented the sad anomaly, for two centuries, of a national Church rejected by half the population.

The equally distinguished John Howe, in reply to Stillingfleet after his defection, writes:—"Somewhat it is likely he was expected (and might be expected) to say to this business; and his own thoughts being set to a work, fermented into an intemperate heat, which, it is to be hoped, will in time evaporate," which, as we have seen, was the case. Bishop Burnet, so intimate with this author, writes of him: "To avoid the imputation that book brought on him, he went into the business of a high sort of people beyond what became him, perhaps beyond his own sense of things."

Our own Bishop White writes concerning the "Irenicum": "The book, however, was, it seems, easier retracted than refuted; for, though offensive to other parties, it was managed, says the same author (Burnet), with so much learning and

skill, that none of either side undertook to answer it." ("The Case of the Episcopal Churches," p. 22.)

Presuming, then, that the testimony of Stillingfleet is the more conclusive from his subsequent history, we give a few extracts from the abundant supply at hand. On page 298, he asserts: "Before the jurisdiction of presbyters was restrained by mutual consent, in this instance, doubtless, the presbyters enjoyed the same liberty that the presbyters among the Jews did, of ordaining other presbyters by the power with which they were invested at their own ordination. In the first primitive Church, the presbyters all acted in common for the welfare of the Church, and either did or might ordain others to the same authority with themselves; because the *intrinsical power of order is equally in them, and in those who were after appointed governors over presbyters.* And the collation of orders doth come from the power of order, and not from the power of jurisdiction. It being, likewise, fully acknowledged by the school-men that bishops are not superior above presbyters as to the power of order.

"But the *clearest evidence* of this is in the Church of Alexandria, of which Hierome speaks: 'For at Alexandria,'" etc. Then quoting the passages we have previously given, and contending that the ordination as well as election was conducted by the presbyters simply, he proceeds:

"To which we may add what *Eutychius*, the patriarch of Alexandria, saith in his *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*, published in Arabic by our most learned Selden, who expressly affirms, 'that the twelve presbyters,'" etc.; then giving the language as we have formerly quoted it, he proceeds: "Neither is the authority of *Eutychius* so much to be slighted in this case, coming so near to Hierome as he doth."

"By these we see that where no positive restraint from constraint and choice, for the unity and peace of the Church, have restrained their liberty as to their external exercise of the power of order or jurisdiction, every one being advanced into the authority of a church governor, hath an internal power of conferring the same on persons fit for it." On page 326, he writes: "At Alexandria, where the succession runs clearest, the original of the powers is imputed to the choice of presbyters, and to no divine institution." On page 398, after showing that in Scotland ordination was practiced by presbyters from A. D. 263 to A. D. 430, he proceeds: "Neither is it any ways sufficient to say that those presbyters did derive their authority from bishops; for, however, we see here a Church governed without such, or if they had any, they were only chosen from their *Culdei*, much after the custom of the Church of Alexandria, as Hector Boethius doth imply." Then, stating that the Gothic churches

were planted and governed by presbyters for seventy years, and the great probability that presbyters ordained in the Church of France, he concludes: "*We nowhere read in those early plantations of churches, that where there were presbyters already, they sent to other Churches to derive episcopal ordination from them.*" And in relation to the doctrine of the Church of England as to the point, on page 438, he writes: "*It is acknowledged by the stoutest champions for Episcopacy, before the late unhappy divisions, that ordination performed by presbyters, in cases of necessity, is valid.*"

In testimony to this last statement he refers to Bishops Jewel, Pilkington, Bridges, Bilson, Alley, Andrews, Downham, Davenant, Prideaux, and Morton, with Drs. Field, Saravia, Nowel, and Mason, "to whom may be added the Primate of Armagh (Ussher), whose judgment is well known as to the point of ordination."

Thus much for the testimony of the seventeenth century. In our next chapter, the witness of living Episcopal writers will be presented.

CHAPTER VI.

MODERN EPISCOPAL WRITERS.

Having presented proof that the Church of England acknowledged the validity of Presbyterian Orders, in the most public manner, for upwards of a century after the compilation of her standards, we proceeded to vindicate her action on the ground that it was in accordance with primitive precedent. That for the space of two hundred years in the Church of Alexandria, after its foundation by St. Mark, no episcopal consecration or succession was practiced or possessed, we have shown by the statements of the early Fathers, and the later writers of the Alexandrian Church. That this was known and acknowledged by the ablest writers of the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has been seen by quotations from their writings.

We proceed now to present the admissions of modern Episcopal writers in relation to a fact which completely silences all exclusive Episcopal claims. And first, —

DR. STANLEY (Dean of Westminster).

In his "History of the Eastern Church" (pp. 326–27), when speaking of the period of the Council of Nice, he says:—

"In a few weeks after the close of the Council, Alexander died, and Athanasius succeeded to the vacant see. It was a marked epoch in every sense for the Egyptian primacy. Down to this time (according to the traditions of the Alexandrian Church itself), the election to the great post had been conducted in a manner unlike to that of the other sees of Christendom. Not the bishop, but twelve presbyters, were the electors and nominators, and (according to Eutychius) consecrators. It was on the death of Alexander that this ancient custom was exchanged for one more nearly resembling that which prevailed elsewhere.

"Jerome speaks of the custom as having lasted only till the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius (Epist. ad Evang. 85). But the tradition of the Alexandrian Church, as preserved in Eutychius (1–331), maintained that it lasted till Alexander. The change which he ascribes to Heraclas is another, which may have led to Jerome's statement, namely, that down to that time there had been no bishop in Egypt except the Bishop of Alexandria."

PROFESSOR LITTON (of Oxford).

This able writer remarks, in his treatise on "The Church of Christ" (p. 570): "When Episcopacy was introduced, to bishops as being so far successors of the Apostles as that they were the highest order of ministers in the Church, the power of ordination was, agreeably to apostolic precedent, reserved — a reservation which was ratified by ancient canons, and has received the sanction of immemorial usage. On this solid ground it is best to rest the practice of Episcopal ordination. That bishops rightly ordain, we can say with certainty; to say that none but they can ordain, is, not only to add something of our own to the written Word, but to set aside the evidence of history, which testifies to the contrary, and to abandon the moderate position taken upon this subject by our most learned divines.

"The most remarkable instance, in which a deviation from the rule that bishops only should ordain, appears to have taken place, is the well-known one of the Alexandrian Church, in which, as Jerome reports, it was the custom for the presbyters 'to choose one of their own number, and placing him in a higher position, to salute him bishop; as if an army should make an emperor, or the deacons should elect one of themselves and call him archdeacon.' (Epist. ad Evang.) To the same effect is the testimony of Hilary the deacon, and of Eutychius of Alexandria. To the

evidence of the former writer Mr. Palmer (on the Church, pt. 6, c. 4), objects that the word 'consignant,' which he (Hilary) uses, signifies not 'ordain,' but 'confirm,' and to that of the latter, that he lived too late (in the tenth century) to have any weight in determining such a question. But, however indecisive the expressions, or the opinions, of late writers separately may be, the presumption in favor of the obvious meaning of Jerome's language, created by their united testimony, is very strong, especially as it is confirmed by a passage which occurs in the book printed with Augustine's works, 'Questiones,' etc.: 'Nam in Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.'" (Ques. 51.)

DR. WILLIAM GOODE.

From "The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice" of this eminent controversialist, we extract the following testimony: —

"That episcopal consecration was *generally* appointed in very early times to be, as it was, the seal to the episcopal appointment, can hardly, I think, be questioned by any one who is at all versed in the records of the Primitive Church; but, nevertheless, there are testimonies occurring which seem to show, not merely that it was not absolutely essential, but that it was not universally practiced.

"For instance, the testimony of Eutychius of Alexandria, is plain that such was not the case originally at Alexandria. His words are these:" Then quoting the passage, he proceeds: "I have given this passage in full, because it has been sometimes replied that it referred only to the *election* of the patriarch, and that we must suppose that he was afterwards consecrated to his office by bishops. But it is evident to any one who takes the whole passage together, that such an explanation is altogether inadmissible; and, moreover, the very same word which (following Selden) I have translated *created*, is used with respect to the acts of the presbyters, and is afterwards used with respect to the acts of the bishops in the appointments. I am quite aware that very considerable learning has been employed in the attempt to explain away this passage, and the reader who wishes to see how a plain statement may thus be darkened, may refer to the works mentioned below."

Commenting on a passage from Renaudot, he continues: "The sole object for which I quote the passage is, to show, that according to Eutychius, the person appointed to the episcopal office in Alexandria held and exercised the duties of the office without any episcopal consecration.

"And this statement of Eutychius is clearly and expressly supported by the testimony of

Jerome, in a passage where he plainly maintains the doctrine that such an appointment is sufficient to constitute a presbyter a bishop, and adduces this example in proof of it."

After quoting Jerome's words, he adds: "This passage, be it observed, does not take away from the episcopate its rights, but distinctly admits that the power of ordination belongs properly to that office, and that its possessor has a higher rank than the presbyter. But, at the same time, it clearly maintains that as it respects the ministerial character, there is no difference between a presbyter and a bishop, the difference being only to be found in the ecclesiastical distribution of *the duties to be performed by them*, and what is still more to our purpose, that *appointment to the episcopal office by the presbyters of the Church is sufficient* (as far as ESSENTIALS are concerned) *to entitle a presbyter to perform the duties of the episcopal function.*

"Now these two positions are perfectly consistent with each other. We may maintain fully even the apostolicity of the episcopal form of church government, and yet deny, that episcopal consecration is a *sine qua non* to the performance of the duties of the bishop or president of a church. And, if we bear this in mind, we shall find that Jerome, notwithstanding the charges of self-contradiction that have been brought against him, is perfectly consistent in what he has written

on this subject. The great point with Jerome manifestly is, that such a president of the Church should be appointed, and such powers conceded to him; and, in his view, when that is done, the essentials are safe." (Vol. ii. pp. 255–59.)

REV. J. E. RIDDLE.

We present another witness in this connection, whose testimony is of great weight from his eminent learning in the department of Christian Antiquities, — Rev. Mr. Riddle, of St. Edmunds Hall, Oxford. As a commentator on the Gospels and Prayer Book, as a Church historian, as a chronologist, a lexicographer, as Bampton lecturer for 1852, and particularly as the compiler of the most learned of English modern works on Christian Antiquities, this author's opinion on the point we are considering is of peculiar value.

From Mr. Riddle's full and candid dissertation on the ancient distinction between the bishop and presbyter, we take the following extract: "Jerome, one of the most learned of the Latin fathers, who had before him all the testimonies and arguments of earlier writers, has placed this matter in its true light with peculiar distinctness. In his annotation on the first chapter of the Epistle to Titus, he gives the following account of the nature and origin of the episcopal office: 'A presbyter is the same as a bishop. And until,

by the instigation of the devil, there arose divisions in religion, and it was said among the people, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas," churches were governed by the Common Council of the presbyters. But afterwards, when every one regarded those whom he baptized as belonging to himself rather than to Christ, it was everywhere decreed that one person, elected from the presbyters, should be placed over the others; to whom the care of the whole church might belong, and thus the seeds of division might be taken away. Should any one suppose that this opinion, — that a bishop and presbyter is the same, and that one is the denomination of age and the other of office, — is not sanctioned by the Scriptures, but is only a private fancy of my own, let him read over again the Apostles' words to the Philippians, —" Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi with the bishops and deacons: Grace be unto you and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ," etc. Philippi is a single city of Macedonia, and certainly, of those who are now styled bishops, there could not have been several at one time in the same city. But, because at that time they called the same persons bishops whom they styled also presbyters, therefore the Apostle spoke indifferently of bishops as of presbyters.'

"The writer then refers to the fact, that St.

Paul, having sent for the *presbyters* (in the plural) *of the single city* of Ephesus only, afterwards calls these same persons *bishops.* (Acts xx.) To this fact he calls particular attention, and then observes that, in the Epistle to the Hebrews also, we find the care of the Church divided equally among many. '"Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy and not with grief, for that is unprofitable for you!" And Peter,' continues Jerome, 'who received his name from the firmness of his faith, says in his Epistle: "The presbyters who are among you I exhort, who am also a presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God which is among you [he omits the word, "taking the oversight thereof," *episcopountes*, i. e., superintending it], not by constraint but willingly." These things we have brought forward to show that, with the ancients, *presbyters were the same as bishops.* But in order that the roots of dissension might be plucked up, *a usage gradually took place that the whole care should devolve upon one.* Therefore, as the presbyters knew that it is *by the custom of the Church that they are subject to him who is placed over them*, so let the bishops know that *they are above presbyters rather by custom than by the Lord's appointment*, and that

they ought *to rule the Church in common*, herein imitating Moses,' etc.

"The same views are maintained by this father in his 'Epistle to Evagrius,' with the additional mention of the fact, that from the first foundation of the Church of Alexandria, down to the days of Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters of that Church made (or, as we should say, consecrated) bishops. The passage, which is quoted at some length in the note, is very important. Having referred to several passages of the Acts and epistles in proof of an assertion which he had made, to the effect that bishop and presbyter were at first the same, he proceeds to say that 'afterwards, when one was elected and set over the others, this was designed as a remedy against schism. . . . . For at Alexandria, from the Evangelist Mark, down to the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always gave the name of bishop to one whom they elected from themselves, and placed in a higher degree; in the same way as an army may create its general, or as deacons may elect one of their own body, whom they know to be assiduous in the discharge of duty, and call him archdeacon. For what does a bishop perform, except ordination, which a presbyter may not do,' etc.

"The fact which Jerome here states, respecting the appointments and ordination of bishops in the Church of Alexandria by presbyters alone, for

the space of more than two centuries, is attested also by Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria. And the opinion of Jerome respecting the original equality, or rather identity, of presbyter and bishop, is in perfect accordance with the language of a still earlier writer, Tertullian, 'De Baptismo,' c. xvii. The two passages together form a text and a commentary, sufficient to elucidate the whole matter:

"'The highest priest, who is the bishop,' says Tertullian, 'has the right of administering baptism. Then the presbyters and deacons, yet not without the authority of the bishop, *because of the honor of the Church*, which being preserved, peace is preserved. Otherwise the right belongs even to laymen. . . . . Emulation is the mother of division. "All things are lawful to me," said the most holy Paul, "but all things are not expedient." Let it suffice that you use your liberty in cases of necessity, when the condition of the person, or the circumstances of the place, compel you to it.'

"Upon the whole, then, it appears that the order (or office) of a bishop is above that of a priest, not by any authority of Scripture, but only by the custom of the Church, or by virtue of an ecclesiastical arrangement" (Riddle's "Antiquities," pp. 235–42, ed. 1843).

The declaration of Jerome, that as late as the fourth century, the authority to ordain was the

sole peculiar privilege of the bishop, and this an ecclesiastical arrangement, not a divine ordinance, is in itself a sufficient refutation of the exclusive Episcopal claim, upon which such a dangerous superstructure of wood, hay, and stubble, has been erected in later times.

In his preface to this same volume, entitled "A Plea for Episcopacy, Charity, and Peace," Riddle writes: "I have thus put together a few thoughts which have arisen in my mind while I have been particularly conversant with works relating to the history and antiquities of the Christian Church. Perhaps even those grounds of episcopacy which I have described as certain and strong, may be regarded by some persons in a different light, while others may think that clear certainty and evidence attach to those which I have ventured to describe as doubtful. But such difference of opinion will not trouble either my readers or myself, if we are duly influenced by Christian humility and a peaceful love of truth.

"Lessons of moderation, candor, and Christian charity, may be continually learnt by a careful examination of church history and antiquities. Great mischief and many dissensions have arisen from refusing to acknowledge certain questions to be doubtful or open, which yet have never been determined, and which it is not needful to compress within narrow limits. The study of Christian antiquities may show that questions do ex-

ist, in connection with the origin and claims of Episcopacy, which, if positively decided and maintained in the affirmative by any one set of persons, must lead to unpleasant differences, and perhaps to a want of Christian sympathy, between those who ought to 'love as brethren.' Let the advocates of different systems of church government treat each other not merely with forbearance, but with unfeigned respect. None of the prevalent systems of the present day can afford to maintain any exclusive claims in the face of history. Nor can such claims consist with charity. . . . .

"The following questions, for example, may well be left open, being such as will always receive different answers from different inquirers.

"Did the Apostles in any way sanction the doctrines commonly connected with the theory of apostolic succession? If an apostolic succession had been designed from the first, it may reasonably be supposed that the Apostles would have made some pointed allusion to such a provision for the transmission of the faith, and for the peace of the Church, especially in their warnings against false doctrines and divisions. But although such warnings are numerous, they contain no intimations of such a bulwark of sound doctrine and centre of Christian unity. St. Paul, in full prospect of the attempts of false teachers, did not charge the elders of Ephesus to abide by the decisions and doctrines of a bishop, but he desired

them to take heed to themselves, and then commended them to God. . . . .

"Whatever may become of apostolic succession as a theory or institute, it is impossible, at all events, to prove the fact of such succession, or to trace it down the stream of time. In this case, the fact seems to involve the doctrine; and if the fact be hopelessly obscure, the doctrine is irrecoverably lost. But can we suppose that the divine Author of our religion has suffered any part of his Gospel to perish? It is, of course, possible that a truly apostolic succession may have existed, although the traces may have entirely disappeared, but must we not allow men to regard such a loss as constituting to render the whole doctrine and institute extremely doubtful? Should we not weaken the good cause of Episcopacy, by insisting upon pretensions which cannot be established, and which may really be fictitious?

"It is impossible to prove the personal succession of modern bishops, in an unbroken episcopal line, from the Apostles, or men of the apostolic age.

"As a matter of history and fact, apostolic succession, in this acceptation of the term, is an absolute nonentity. Call it a theory, a fiction, a vision, or whatever you choose, you cannot give it a name too shadowy and unsubstantial. It exists, indeed, as an honest prejudice in the minds of many sincere Christians, and so far is entitled

to consideration and respect. But in itself it is an empty sound.

"Doubtless the custom of setting apart men for the Christian ministry by the laying on of hands, has existed in the Church from the apostolic age, having been originally derived from the practice of the Jewish synagogues, under which institution all who were appointed as fixed ministers, to take care of the performance of religious duties, were solemnly appointed in this manner. The hands of the Apostles and their contemporaries form, therefore, the first link of a chain which has extended to the present day; and this circumstance is a pleasing subject of contemplation to the minds of many persons, and especially to the members of those churches which have retained the custom. But we must be in possession of many other particulars, which are irrevocably lost, in order to build upon this fact the doctrine of a succession, derived from the Apostles themselves, in the line of bishops alone, and for the conveyance of a peculiar grace" (Preface to Riddle's "Antiquities," pp. 41, 46; 50, 51).

The views of the most distinguished writers of the Church of England, with respect to apostolic succession, are given at the end of the volume.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ARGUMENT OF AN EPISCOPAL LAYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, WITH RESPECT TO THE ORDINATIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA.

We quote from "An Inquiry into the Scriptural View of the Constitution of a Christian Church," etc., by William Albin Garratt, A. M., Barrister at Law. London: 1846.

As the view taken by a lay member of the Church of England, employing a legal mind in the examination of historical testimony, we regard the passage as eminently valuable, and therefore quote it almost entire. On the laity of the Church, under God, depends its deliverance from its present dangers, and to them especially is commended a careful examination of the testimony here presented. On p. 367, this author writes: "Eutychius, of Alexandria, after mentioning that Mark the Evangelist went and preached at Alexandria, and appointed Hananias the first patriarch of that city, adds." The author, after quoting Eutychius, and then Severus, whose language we have before given, says: "The slight apparent discrepancy between these two passages

may easily be removed. Eutychius mentions the twelve presbyters only in whom the appointment of patriarch was vested, from whom the patriarch was to be chosen, and of whom the remaining eleven were to lay their hands on his head. Severus says that the priests (sacerdotes) and people were assembled; while Eutychius does not say that the people were excluded from being present at the appointment of a new patriarch. Severus mentions the priests generally, not particularly specifying the twelve presbyters; nor had he any occasion to specify them, as he does not mention the election, but only the assembling and the laying on of hands and the enthroning. We may, indeed, infer from the tenor of this narrative that the election in the case of Peter was merely formal; the choice having been previously fixed upon him as the spiritual son and disciple of Theonas, and in pursuance of his 'command' (his recommendation probably). Lastly, Severus, if taken literally and strictly, would seem to say that the persons assembled, priests and people, laid hands on Peter; but no one would understand him to say that every individual present laid his hands on Peter. The plain meaning is, that those of the individuals assembled whose office it was laid hands on the patriarch elect, the others being assembled to witness the transaction.

"We have, then, in Eutychius, illustrated and confirmed by Severus, distinct evidence of the ex-

istence of a custom in the Church of Alexandria differing altogether from the customs mentioned by Cyprian, as prevailing among the African churches in his province; a custom traced back to the time of Mark the Evangelist; a custom which vested the *election* and *creation* of the patriarch in twelve presbyters without the concurrence of any bishop. The eleven presbyters who remained after one of their number had been elected bishop, laid their hands upon his head and implored a blessing upon him, thereby setting him apart for his new office as the 'prophets and teachers,' not 'apostles or bishops,' which were in the Church at Antioch, 'fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on' Paul (an apostle already) and Barnabas, and 'sent them away,' thus separating them for 'the work' to which the Holy Ghost had 'called them,' — the missionary journey on which they went, as related immediately afterwards.

"By this election and imposition of *presbyters'* hands, the individual was, according to Eutychius, *created* patriarch, invested therefore (without episcopal intervention), with the full authority of the episcopal office, and, accordingly (as we learn from Severus), Peter, immediately on being so appointed, was placed on the patriarchal *throne*. This statement of Severus overturns the fancy of some persons, that the rule mentioned by Eutychius related only to the election, and that the patriarch elect was afterwards ordained by bish-

ops. A fancy which Mr. Goode, on other grounds, has shown to be without foundation. This view of the usage of the Church of Alexandria is confirmed by a passage in Jerome (born about A. D. 345), which, on account of its importance, I have quoted at some length." Having given the passage as we have previously quoted it, he proceeds: "In this passage Jerome not only confirms Eutychius' statement of the custom of the Church of Alexandria, but shows his understanding of the custom to be that the presbyters there *exclusively* appointed their bishops; and he further tells us how bishops were originally introduced into the Church.

"He confirms the statements of Eutychius, though he speaks of the custom as continuing (not till Alexander, but) till Heraclas and Dionysius, bishops. . . . . He must have derived his information from some other source, probably from some writer contemporary with Heraclas and Dionysius, from whom, of course, he would only have learned that the custom had continued till their time; and he does not say that it has ceased. His, therefore, is testimony independent of those of Eutychius and Severus, and probably derived from an earlier source, contemporary with the existence of the custom. It leaves no room to doubt the accuracy of the statements of Eutychius and Severus.

"More than this, Jerome's testimony establishes

as correct that view of the custom which ascribes to the presbyter from first to last the appointment of the Patriarch of Alexandria; not only his election (*unum ex se electum*), but his elevation to a higher rank; for Jerome compares the proceeding to that of an army constituting a general (*imperatorem faciat*), which, according to the Roman custom, was by acclamation, or of deans choosing an archdeacon. And the whole tenor of the passage shows that Jerome intended to state the appointment of the bishops of Alexandria as made *without any episcopal interference or sanction;* on the custom *so understood* his argument is founded, and it is intelligible on no other hypothesis. He asks, indeed, 'What does a bishop do, with the exception of ordination, which a presbyter may not do?' But he does not ascribe this exception to any difference of apostolic commission between a bishop and presbyter. His position is that 'the bishop and the presbyter are the same,' both '*successors of the Apostles*,' successors (not in the sense of a transmitted commission, but) as holding in the Church the same office of pastors and teachers, the bishop being placed 'over the rest' as their ruler.

"And this is obviously the ground of the exception, it belonging to the *bishop, as chief ruler of the Church*, to ordain; an exception, therefore, limited to the case of a church having a bishop, and not precluding the presbyters (when the see

is vacant) from electing and laying hands (as those of Alexandria did) on their new bishop."

"Once more, Jerome's account of the introduction of bishops, as distinguished from presbyters, deserves serious attention. Jerome had his faults, — and great faults, — but he was a man of extensive learning. He argues from Scripture that 'a bishop and presbyter' are the same; and then adds, that 'afterwards one was chosen over the sect.' Why? 'To prevent schism;' to form a bond of union between the presbyters, and again to facilitate union among the different churches. That he is right in his view of the passages of Scripture which he cites (Phil. i. 1, Acts xx. 28, Tit. i. 5, 1 Tim. iv. 14, 1 Peter v. 1, 2 John i., and 3 John i.) is, I think, clear, and will scarcely be disputed by any one, though an advocate for Episcopacy, who has carefully considered the question; and what he adds, as a matter of fact, respecting the purpose for which one person was 'chosen to be over the rest,' is not inconsistent with what we read in the epistles to the seven apocalyptic churches, or with the facts which have been deduced from our examination of the Fathers down to the time of Cyprian. It is a statement which implies a gradual introduction of Episcopacy into the churches, first into one church, and then into another; a statement in perfect harmony with the result which I deduced from an examination of several epistles of the apostolic fathers,

and at the same time utterly at variance with the notion of apostolic succession by episcopal ordination. The purpose, however, for which principally I quote this passage of Jerome, is not for his opinion respecting the bishops and presbyters, but to confirm the statements of Eutychius respecting the original custom of the Church of Alexandria in the appointment of its patriarchs, and to overturn the erroneous glosses sought to be put upon it.

"I now revert to that statement of Eutychius as incontrovertibly correct, and as establishing that, from the time of Hananias, who was appointed by St. Mark Bishop of Alexandria, till after the Council of Nice, a period of more than two centuries, the twelve presbyters of Alexandria elected from among themselves their bishop or patriarch, and by their appointment of him to the episcopal office (the other eleven laying hands opon him) constituted him bishop or patriarch, the ruler of their church, entitled (without any sanction or confirmation of any other bishop) to perform all the duties of the episcopal office.

"It is further evident from the statement that this practice existed when there was no want of bishops to ordain or consecrate (had that been thought necessary) the patriarch. For Alexander (the patriarch who put an end to the custom) is said to have transferred the election to 'the bishops;' and may we not, from this expression, and

from the title given to the bishops of Alexandria, reasonably conclude that Alexandria was a mother church by which other churches had been founded with bishops of their own? Yet these bishops took no part in the appointment of the patriarchs until after the Council of Nice.

"Further, this custom was observed for more than two centuries without objection being made to it; observed, not in an obscure church, but in one of the principal churches of the age, in the chief city and metropolitan church of Egypt, in a church and city of which the catechetical school, successively under Clement and Origen, was renowned throughout the world. Its patriarchs (those created by the presbyters) were recognized by other churches, and we learn from the statements in Eutychius, that its patriarch Alexander was one of the three hundred and eighteen bishops assembled at the Council of Nice. What then is the effect of this one fact? What is the effect of this Alexandrian custom upon the question of episcopal succession by *episcopal ordination* from the times of the Apostles?

"In the first place, it confirms the objections which I have offered to various passages in Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian, being received as evidence in support of the alleged '*fact* of apostolical succession' in the Tractarian sense of the word; those passages I mean in which the writer either speaks in general terms of succession

or episcopal succession from the Apostles, or asserts that apostolical churches can enumerate the succession of their bishops, from the first bishop appointed by an apostle. It annihilates all such passages *as evidence for such a purpose.* The Alexandrian patriarchs, Heraclas, or Dionysius, or Alexander, could, with strict truth, have talked of episcopal succession in this church, from the first bishop appointed by Mark the Evangelist, and have enumerated the succession of bishops of Alexandria from that first bishop, and yet those bishops were 'created' by the presbyters; yet they were not episcopally ordained to the office of bishop.

"In the next place, the Alexandrian custom makes a gap in apostolical succession, through episcopal ordination, which can never be filled up; breaks a link in the supposed chain which can in no way be replaced. Even if it could be shown that the custom was peculiar to the Church of Alexandria, how could any bishop of the present day, tracing back his succession through a series of bishops to an apostle, prove satisfactorily that no individual in that series had derived, mediately or immediately, from one of these Alexandrian patriarchs? But can it be shown that the custom was, in the first ages of Christianity, peculiar to the Church of Alexandria? Is it probable that the Evangelist St. Mark should have there introduced a usage at variance

with the practice of other churches? The truth seems to be that the Apostles laid down general principles for the government of churches and the appointment of ministers; and that those principles were variously carried out in different churches, according to circumstances, resulting in some churches earlier, in others later, in all ultimately, in the threefold distinction of ministers, as consonant with, but not essentially required by, those principles" (pp. 367–79).

This able review, after thorough examination of Scriptural and patristic testimony, concludes: "Firstly, that a church, bearing a threefold ministry of bishops, elders, and deacons is conformable to the plan ultimately introduced, with the apostolic sanction, into the churches of Asia Minor, and consequently consistent with the will of God; secondly, that such a form of church government is the *best, where the* circumstances of the Church do not essentially differ from those of the seven Asiatic churches; and, thirdly, that a church possessing that form of government ought not to depart from it without clear and strong grounds, such as an obvious necessity for the preservation of the true faith." "But we cannot conclude from any practice of the Church, as recorded in the New Testament, either, firstly, that a church sound in apostolic doctrine, but wanting the threefold ministry, is not a true Church of Christ; or, secondly, that a church having both an apostolic doctrine and a threefold

ministry, but whose bishops cannot trace back an uninterrupted succession to an apostle, is not a true Church of Christ" (pp. 198, 199).

We think great good might be done by the republication of this able and candid work by a clear-headed layman.

BOWDLER'S VIEW.

We give, in this connection, the language of another able layman of the Church of England, who has employed his pen against the modern innovators on her doctrines: —

"It is no part of my plan to trace the origin or course of departure from the system of church government in the apostolical times, as it lies before us in all its simplicity. I admit — indeed, as the lawyers say, it is a part of my case — that some change was unavoidable; and I see nothing in the present constitution of the Church of England that is inconsistent with the *principles* of the Apostles. But to say that they are identical is a mere abuse of words. Still less is it to be heard say, without some impatience, that there is safety in her communion only, as she has descended from the Apostles, through all the changes and abominations that have intervened."

After an examination of the primitive writers he proceeds: "I am aware that in St. Jerome's time there existed generally, though by no means universally, this difference between the bishop and the presbyter, namely, that to the former was

then confided the power of ordination. The transition from perfect equality to absolute superiority was not suddenly effected; it was the growth of time, not of years, but of centuries, the distinction of authority or office preceding that of order or degree in the Church, and being introductory to it. With the former I have no concern, it being sufficient to show, that as a distinct and superior order in the Church, Episcopacy, in the modern acceptation of the term, did not exist in the time of the Apostles; and that, however expedient and desirable such an institution might be, it cannot plead the sanction of apostolic appointment or example.

"It may be difficult to fix the period exactly when the episcopate was first recognized as a distinct *order* in the Church, and when the consecration of bishops, as such, came to be in general use. Clearly not, I think, when Jerome wrote. Thus much, at least, is certain, namely, that the government of each Church, *including the ordination of ministers*, was at first in the hands of the presbytery; that when one of that body was raised to the office of president, and on whom the title of bishop was conferred, it was simply by the election (co-optatio) of the other presbyters, whose appointment was final, requiring no confirmation or consecration at the hands of any other prelates, and that each Church was essentially independent of every other.

"If, then, all this be so, there seems to be an

end to the question; for, under whatever circumstances the privilege of ordaining was afterwards committed to the bishop, he could of necessity receive no more than it was in their power to bestow, from whom he received it, who were coordinate presbyters, not superiors. At whatever period, therefore, it were adopted, and with whatever uniformity it might be continued, and whatever of value or even authority it might hence acquire, still, as an apostolical institution, it has none; there is a gap which can never be filled, or rather, the link by which the whole must be suspended is wanting, and can never be supplied. There can be no apostolical succession of that which had no apostolical existence; whereas, the averment, to be of any avail, must be, not only that it existed in the time of the Apostles, but was *so* appointed by them, or that there can be no true Church without it." ("Bowdler's Letters on Apostolic Succession," pp. 32–48.)

That two laymen of ability and learning, after a thorough examination of the subject, should come to the same conclusion, and this in opposition to the general current of opinion in their Church, is certainly strongly confirmatory of the position here maintained, and should induce our intelligent laity to investigate the basis of a system which, confessedly, is doing so much damage to the cause of peace and unity in our communion, and promoting schism among the common brotherhood of the faith.

CHAPTER VIII.

ROMAN CATHOLIC TESTIMONY.

In giving the language of Drs. Stanley, Litton, Goode, and Riddle, with respect to the Alexandrian presbyterial ordination, we have presented the concessions of some of the ablest of living Episcopal writers, sufficient for our purpose, and we now offer

ROMAN CATHOLIC TESTIMONY.

The concession of writers of the Roman Church strengthen the force of our argument, an we therefore give the language of the learned

MORINUS,

as quoted by Dr. Goode. Dr. Goode remarks: "It is most important to observe, that even the Romanist Morinus, one of the most learned divines of the Church of Rome, fully admits, and even maintains by the citations of various testimonies, that this was for a long period the custom at Alexandria, referring for proof particularly to the passage of Jerome, just cited, and vindicating the meaning I have affixed to it against ob-

jections. He finds fault, indeed, with the passage of Eutychius on other grounds, but with that I have no concern. I adduce it simply to show that in the case to which it refers, episcopal consecration was not considered necessary to constitute a presbyter a bishop." Now, on this point, Morinus himself speaks thus: "St. Jerome testifies that at Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist to Dionysius, that is, for the space of nearly two hundred years, the bishops were inaugurated without any consecration, but the presbyters of Alexandria, when their bishop was dead, elected one of their own order, and belonging to their own church, and placed him upon the higher throne, and called him bishop. By which example, truly, it most clearly appears that neither Jerome nor the Alexandrians recognized that character by which a bishop is said to be above a presbyter, since no prayer, no ceremony, no form of words, was used above the presbyters elected. You will say he mentions none, but it cannot well be concluded that there was none, since it is certain that authors do not always relate everything that took place. This indeed is true, but the scope and words of St. Jerome do not admit of this objection. For he contends, that a presbyter is the same as a bishop, and proves this from the peculiar and unusual custom of the Alexandrians, who made use of no consecration, no words to consecrate as a bishop the presbyter

elected by them, but only placed him on the throne, and called him bishop."

Referring to the "Breviarum" of Liberatus, p. 122, he says: "It clearly follows from it that for at least two hundred years after Alexander, the presbyters of Alexandria, not the bishops, elected the patriarch; and that neither the presbyters nor the bishops, nor any other person, laid their hands on the person elected."

Bishop Jewel states that it was the custom "for the newly elected patriarch to place the hand of his deceased predecessor on his own head."

The statement of Jewel is confirmed by Bingham in his "Antiquities."

The inquiry here arises — Did the succession flow through the hand of the dead patriarch, or from the living presbyters, and which was the better of the two?

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS.

It is not surprising that this remarkable fact in ecclesiastical history has much troubled our more extravagant and exclusive Episcopal writers, and among others,

BISHOP PEARSON,

of revered and honored memory.

This learned writer professes to discredit the testimony of Eutychius, in his "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ," while at the same time, he quotes him elsewhere as an authority with respect to the chronology of the early Roman Church.

Gibbon remarks (vol. i. p. 108): "The ancient state, as it is described by Jerome, of the bishops and presbyters of Alexandria, receives a remarkable confirmation from the patriarch Eutychius (Annal., tom. i., p. 330, vers. Pococke), whose testimony I know not how to reject, in spite of all the objections of the learned Pearson in his 'Vindiciæ Ignatianæ.'" And page 131, "Its internal evidence would be a sufficient answer to all that Pearson has urged." On a question of

this kind, we may regard Gibbon as an impartial and reliable authority.

OTHER OBJECTIONS.

We find, in the seventeenth century, Bishop Parker and Dr. Hickes; and in our times, Hobart, Bowden, Cooke, Chapin, Jarvis, Boyd, and Percival, offering criticisms similar to those of Pearson and Palmer.

As a specimen, Dr. Jarvis objects that "Selden, who made this discovery, had not a profound knowledge of Arabic, nor was he well versed in ecclesiastical history." Such language borders on the ludicrous. Dr. Pococke assisted Selden in his translation, and according to the "Encyclopædia Britannica," "Pococke was for many years the first orientalist in Europe." He afterwards published the complete works of Eutychius, to which edition Gibbon refers.

Of Selden, Bishop Jebb writes: "Of this great man's attainments, it were superfluous to speak; his life, properly told, would be a complete history of the learning of his time." Lord Clarendon says: "Mr. Selden was a person whom no character can flatter, or transmit in any expressions equal to his mind and virtue. He was of such stupendous learning, in all kinds and in all languages, as may appear from his excellent and transcendent writings, that a man would have thought he had been entirely conversant among

books, and had never spent an hour but in reading and writing." Archbishop Usher, the greatest scholar of his century, in his funeral sermon over Selden, said: "He looked upon the deceased as so great a scholar, that himself was scarce worthy to carry his books after him" (Elrington's "Usher," p. 273).

To the objections of Palmer, we have given the reply of Dr. Litton.

Bowden, Hobart, and Cooke have endeavored to disparage the testimony of Eutychius, by charging him with ignorance of the facts, misstatements, etc. To such objections, and to the charge that the work has been garbled, we reply with Mosheim, that Eutychius was "the most learned man of his nation, in medicine and theology," in a most learned time; with Giesler, "It is at least certain that the part which is contradictory to the usage of later times, has not been interpolated, and so far has a historic value." And in the apt words of Stillingfleet, in answer to Pearson ("Irenicum" p. 300), "Neither is the authority of Eutychius so much to be slighted in this case, coming so near to Hierome as he doth, who doubtless had he told us, that Mark and Ananias, etc., did all these without any presbyters, might have had the good fortune to have been quoted with as much frequency and authority as the anonymous author of the martyrdom of Timothy in 'Photius' (who there unhappily follows the story of the seven sleepers),

or the author of the 'Apostolical Constitutions' whose credit is everlastingly blasted by the excellent Mr. Daille, on the counterfeit writings of the Apostles, so much do men's interest tend to the enhancing or abating the esteem and credit both of the dead and living."

REV. J. M. NEALE.

This author, in his recent elaborate history of the "Church of Alexandria," endeavors to overthrow the testimony of Eutychius, by charging him with ignorance. He contends that the act of the presbyters was simply an election. One of his most prominent authorities, Le Quien, he confesses, was "ignorant of Arabic." Neale offers nothing new in his argument.

FULL STATEMENTS OF OPPONENTS.

In order that our readers may see all that may be said on the opposite side of this vital question on the point of succession, we give the full arguments of three of the most recent exclusive episcopal writers.

DR. PERCIVAL.

And first, Percival on the "Apostolical Succession," p. 26, writes: "The next precedent cited, is that of Alexandria, where it is pretended that, for about two hundred and fifty years after Christ, the presbyters ordained the bishop. This rests upon the supposed testimony of two witnesses —

St. Jerome, who lived one hundred and fifty years, and Eutychius, who lived seven hundred and fifty years after the time mentioned. I wonder what would be said of any churchman who would attempt to found a precedent on two single witnesses so far removed. However, let us consider what their evidence amounts to. St. Jerome speaks thus: 'At Alexandria, from the Evangelist Mark, to Heraclas and Dionysius the bishops, the presbyters always gave the name of bishop, or nominated to be bishop, one chosen from among themselves, and placed in a higher degree.' Observe, firstly, the utmost that can be made of this passage, by itself, is that the presbyters at Alexandria had a voice in the appointment of the patriarch, which in other places rested with the bishops of the province. And even this is not distinctly stated. Jerome does not say the bishop was chosen *by* the presbyters, but *from among* them. Nor does he say *by whom* he was placed in a higher degree. Observe, secondly, that St. Jerome proves, by his very next sentence, that he did not mean that the presbyters ordained the patriarch; for he subjoins, 'For what does a bishop do, except ordination, which a presbyter may not do?' Observe, thirdly, that from the very passage appealed to by the Presbyterians, it appears that, from the days of St. Mark, the founder of the Church of Alexandria inclusive, the Church there had always been governed by a single chief

pastor, called bishop, of a *higher degree* than presbyters; so that episcopacy is admitted to be an evangelical arrangement. Thus the chief evidence witnesses the direct contrary to that for which appeal had been made to him. Next, let us call the other witness, Eutychius, a writer of the tenth century, who states that 'St. Mark instituted twelve presbyters at Alexandria, who, upon the vacancy of the See of Alexandria, did choose of their number one to be head over the rest, and the other seven did lay their hands upon him, and made him patriarch.'

"But observe, firstly, that even if we could receive Eutychius' statements without exception, before the Presbyterians could derive any benefit from it, they must show first, reason to believe that the presbytery here spoken of was not an episcopal, or apostolic college, as we have seen before; that all the early commentators understood the presbytery (1 Tim. iv. 14) to be. Secondly, that the patriarch thus appointed, received no other ordination, and then, when they have done all this, still thus much will remain proved against them, by this very story, that ecclesiastical government, by a community of presbyters, without a chief pastor over them, was unknown at Alexandria, as well as in the rest of Christendom.

"But observe, secondly, that if Eutychius, who lived in the tenth century, is allowed to be a com-

petent witness of what happened in the first and second, Severus, a writer of the same age and country, must be also allowed to bear testimony. Severus distinctly speaks of bishops and presbyters and laity being all concerned in the appointments of patriarchs of Alexandria, in the very earliest successions. So that we must inquire further, whether any other historical evidence that may be adduced on the point, tends most to confirm Eutychius or Severus. Now, firstly, it is certain that all the other churches received the canons, called apostolical, which require a bishop to be ordained by two or three bishops, and recognize no other order as qualified to ordain. Between these churches and Alexandria, constant communication was kept up, sometimes on the most friendly, sometimes on the most unfriendly footing. But in none of their intercourse, neither amicable or hostile, is this point of difference ever urged; which, sure, it would have been, on one side or the other, as a handle of reproach, if it had really existed. Secondly, the learned Abraham Echellensis has shown that, from the beginning, these very canons were received by the Church of Alexandria itself; so that the Christians there must have violated their own laws, had they done as the Presbyterians suppose. Thirdly, we find from other quarters that, early as A. D. 300, there were not less than one hundred bishops in the patriarchate of Alexandria. Fourthly, which

seems decisive of the point, we find a question coming before a council of Alexandria, A. D. 339, concerning one Ischryas, who acted as a presbyter, pretending to have received orders from a certain Colluthus. But when it was made plain that Colluthus himself had died a presbyter, the council decreed that all on whom he had laid hands should be regarded as mere laymen. Surely the world will hardly be persuaded that the council would have thus denied the power of a presbyter to ordain even a presbyter, if, in the memory of living men at the time, their patriarch himself had received no other ordination. What then must we suppose to have been the ground of the opinions expressed by Jerome and Eutychius? Simply some peculiar privileges in the *election* of the patriarchs of Alexandria which, from several other quarters, we learn that the presbyters of that city possessed.

"Abraham Echellensis, in the documents relating to the Alexandrian Church, which he has collected, has preserved one which gives an account of a discussion between the bishops of the province and the presbyters of the city, upon this very point; in which, while the bishops freely acknowledge the right of election to be in the presbyters, they as freely asserted their right of veto upon such election, provided the persons elected were unworthy of the office." (See Le Quien, in his "Oriens Christianus; Patr. Alex.")

As to the statements of Percival, it may be observed: —

1st. If Jerome is not to be received as a witness, because living one hundred and fifty years after the events described, why is Eusebius more worthy of credence, who lived as long after the men whose succession he gives, upon what he confesses to be uncertain testimony? Without Eusebius, Percival could not pretend to present authority in regard to episcopal succession. Jerome, moreover, had access to all the authorities which were in the hands of Eusebius.

2d. It should be borne in mind that there were no bishops in the neighborhood to ordain the patriarch. This is a sufficient answer to nearly all the objections of Percival.

3d. Because Jerome states that bishops enjoyed in the fourth century one privilege beyond presbyters, namely, that of ordaining, it does not follow that it had always been regarded as essential for them to ordain, or that they received the right by episcopal succession, or, that the exclusive privilege was divinely conferred. The opposite is clearly established in this discussion.

4th. Scriptural Episcopacy, it is here asserted, always existed at Alexandria; episcopal *government*, but not episcopal *succession*. Confusion on this point is the source of most of the difficulties in this controversy.

5th. Percival does not give the language of

Severus. Eutychius *confirms Jerome's* testimony. Severus contradicts Jerome. Severus must, therefore, be untrustworthy.

6th. The facts prove that the Alexandrian Church did not receive the so-called Apostolical Canons. Dr. Whittaker states in his "Disputation of Scripture" (p. 508): "The canons which go under the name of the Apostles are suppositions." Fulke, his contemporary, styles them "the counterfeit canons," and Whitgift says (vol. ii. p. 121): "There is a great suspicion in the counterfeiting of them."

7th. Of Abraham Echellensis, Johnson, the biographer of Selden (p. 288), states: "This Abraham Echellensis was a Maronite priest, in the pay of the Roman Pontiff, and he employed so much personal abuse in an attempt to refute Selden, that he injured his own reputation more than that of him whom he attacked."

8th. What occurred after the year 300 has no bearing on the argument.

9th. In regard to Colluthus, Stillingfleet affirms that the ordinations of Colluthus were pronounced invalid, because conferred "without the diocese" and "without a title." They were void because done "in contempt of ecclesiastical canons," canons made after the times under consideration. The case of Colluthus has clearly nothing to do with our subject.

DR. JARVIS.

We proceed now to give all that a learned countryman, Dr. Samuel F. Jarvis, has to offer in opposition to the ground here taken. In Chapin's "Primitive Church" (p. 200), Dr. Jarvis adds in a note: "In Egypt the ancient custom originally was, and now is, to have a threefold imposition of hands in the creation of bishops. The votes of the people were given and numbered by lifting up of hands, and confirmed by the laying on of hands by the principal laity. The presbyters laid their hands twice on the head of the person elected, first in giving their votes, and afterwards their solemn approbation of his admission to the episcopate. The bishops also twice laid on their hands, first, to confirm their suffrage, and finally at their consecration. The following is the order prescribed in the ancient constitutions of the Church in Alexandria." After quoting canons to this effect, Dr. Jarvis proceeds: —

"This also furnishes an answer to another argument urged against this conclusion. During the troubles in the reign of Charles the First, an attempt was made to prove that the churches of Alexandria, founded by St. Mark, were originally Presbyterian. An extract from the Annals of Eutychius, who succeeded Christobulus, A. D. 933, as the Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria, was employed for this purpose. Selden, who made this discovery, had not a profound knowl-

edge of Arabic, nor was he well versed in ecclesiastical history. His translation, therefore, was inaccurate in several points, which vitally affected his argument; and he seems not to have been aware, that the ancient records of the Egyptian Church were inaccessible to Eutychius, and that his testimony is of no value, except with regard to the history of the Melchites. These facts show, most conclusively, that both Caius and Eutychius were mistaken, and that at Alexandria, as elsewhere, none but bishops ordained. This Jerome himself allows, in opposition to the authority he had quoted, if, indeed, it is quoted correctly."

In reply to this statement we remark. 1st. How ancient the custom and canons alluded to were, the writer does not state. They were manifestly later than the period we are discussing, and, therefore, of no account in this argument.

2d. The establishment of our point proves that the Church of Alexandria was Episcopal, not Presbyterian, and therefore one allegation of Dr. Jarvis is false. It was the efforts of Laud to change the ancient principles of the Church, and to establish the divine right of episcopal succession, which drove Selden, Owen, Baxter, and others out of the Church of England; which produced the schism in the Church; which led to the civil war; at the restoration inflicted upon

Christianity the stain of a second St. Bartholomew's Day; drove from their pulpits near two thousand of the best ministers of England; brought down the Divine judgment in the form of a century of ecclesiastical torpor; has kept half the population out of a so called national Church; which in our own land has made our Church a mere handful of the nation, and is rapidly destroying its reputation and influence. Selden did not try to establish Presbyterianism, but as a wise and intelligent layman he opposed ecclesiastical tyranny. His friend, Archbishop Usher, endorsed his work on Eutychius, and labored to restore the primitive, moderate Episcopacy. He failed, and the Church has reaped the sad harvest. The unjust animadversions of Jarvis on Selden's learning we have already noticed (p. 85), and we find nothing further in this author's statement that needs a reply.

DR. MAHAN.

The latest effort to disprove the statements of Jerome, Eutychius, and others, we find, is that of Professor Milo Mahan, who, in his "Church History" (p. 227), writes: "In the constitution of the Episcopate of Alexandria there seems to have been some departure from the general practice of the Church, the exact nature of which, however, it is not easy to determine. The amplest account of the peculiarity is given by

Eutychius, a patriarch of Alexandria in the tenth century." After giving the language of Eutychius, he proceeds: "St. Jerome gives substantially the same account, except that he makes no mention of *ordination* by the eleven, and says the change of custom occurred in the times of Heraclas and Dionysius.

"In the silence of contemporaries on the subject, and from the vagueness and lateness of the testimony given, there is room for the conjecture that Egypt, instead of being divided among several local sees, was governed for a while by a college of twelve chief pastors residing in Alexandria, the bishop of that see being at their head. Nothing could be more natural than such an arrangement, at the first planting of the Church. In later times, however, as the Gospel extended into the provinces, it would be found inconvenient, and each important city would desire a resident bishop of its own. This is the most natural inference, if the language of Eutychius be taken to the letter. For the presbyters mentioned by him were presbyters who had power to ordain; but presbyters with power to ordain are the same as bishops, in the restricted sense of the word. As St. Jerome says, in connection with this subject, 'What does a bishop do, *except ordination*, which a presbyter cannot do?'

"This is said on the supposition that the eleven both elected and ordained their patriarch. But,

as that point is not certain, resting only on the testimony of a writer manifestly inaccurate in language, and living six centuries after the period of which he speaks, the peculiarity of the Church of Alexandria may have been merely that of electing a bishop out of a close corporation of twelve presbyters, instead of choosing from the Church at large, as was customary in other places."

In a note he adds: "It is fatal to the theory of any radical or even marked change in the church government of Egypt, that the period in question is covered by the names of Origen, Meletius, and others, who belonged to an *opposition party*, and who certainly would have made themselves heard, if the ruling party had been guilty of innovations. . . . It is hardly necessary to remind the reader, that the term Presbyter, like the term Priest, or Sacerdos, was often used as a name for the ministry in general, and, therefore, might be applied to any order. 2 John, i. 3; John, i. 1; Peter, v. 1."

We have here, then, all that an ingenious writer, in the light of the past, can offer, to offset the historical testimony given with regard to the omission of episcopal consecration and succession in the famous Alexandrian Church. Such a statement virtually yields the point in dispute. The testimony of Jerome is not here disputed,

and as the fact that there were no bishops in Alexandria, or in the neighborhood, after the death of the patriarch, cannot be controverted, there remains nothing in the remarks of this author which requires an answer.

CHAPTER X.

RECAPITULATION.

We propose briefly to recapitulate the arguments by which (as we think) we have established the fact that in the patriarchal church of Alexandria, the patriarch was elected by presbyters for the space of over two hundred years, and had no episcopal consecration whatever.

1st. In the first place, we gave the clear, decisive testimony of Jerome, and of a contemporary, who lived within a century after the custom described.

2d. We presented the full and particular statement of Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and of another later Egyptian writer, confirming the facts.

3d. We showed by standard writers of the Church of England, during the Reformation, that these facts were well known at that time.

4th. The statements of the most learned writers of the next century were presented, confirming the same.

5th. Four of the ablest living scholars of the

Church of England were quoted, as acknowledging the truth of our statement.

6th. As evidence of the views of Roman Catholic writers, the language of Morinus was given, who fully acknowledged the truth of the historical fact we have undertaken to substantiate.

7th. Gibbon was quoted, answering the objections of Bishop Pearson and others, who have sought to establish the exclusive view.

8th. After meeting the objections of Jarvis, Palmer, Percival, and Mahan, we closed the argument with an historical criticism by an accomplished barrister of the English Church, who feels compelled, after full investigation, to acknowledge that the testimony of history on this point is satisfactory and conclusive.

Such is the testimony offered with regard to this custom of the Church of Alexandria.

The evidence is more certain and accurate than we possess with respect to the manner of ordination of any other primitive church. There has been more dispute with respect to Ignatius, and the Church of Antioch, than with regard to the statements of Eutychius.

With regard to the Church of Antioch, Jerome differs from Origen and Eusebius, and these from other writers.

With respect to the Church of Rome, no one knows whether St. Peter visited Rome or not.

There is no satisfactory proof to this effect, while the probabilities are that he never saw Rome.

No one can tell who was the first Bishop of Rome, and there are at least twelve differing opinions as to who were the first six bishops, and their order. Truly, as Stillingfleet remarks, "The succession of Rome is as muddy as the Tiber," and its doctrine more muddy than its succession. Our knowledge of the ancient successions is almost wholly derived from Eusebius, while Jerome had access to the same authors as the former writer.

The following important results flow from the establishment of the historical point we have ventilated: —

1st. There was no uniform manner of ordination established by the Apostles.

2d. Consecration by presbyters was practiced in one of the great patriarchates for more than two centuries immediately succeeding the Apostles, or, election without consecration was deemed sufficient to constitute a bishop.

3d. Succession through presbyterian ordination was acknowledged by the Primitive Church, Alexander and Athanasius of Alexandria being among the foremost members of the Council of Nice. Bingham states that the Patriarch of Alexandria consecrated all the bishops of his vast province, and claimed the right of ordaining all the elders and deacons; consequently, the celebrated Athanasius had but a presbyterian succession, and his

orders were worth as much as those of the Methodist Bishop Asbury, and the Lutheran superintendents.

4th. The Church of England was right in allowing the full validity of presbyterian orders.

5th. All those who acknowledge such ordination are both Anglican and Primitive; those who deny it are opposed both to the Anglican and Primitive Churches.

6th. Archbishop Laud, in introducing among Protestants the doctrine that episcopal orders are alone valid, was an ecclesiastical innovator, and a promoter of schism.

7th. That his system, as adopted by the Nonjurors and Tractarians and their sympathizers, is founded on error, and is chargeable with the dissensions which have divided, distracted, and deeply injured the reputation and influence of the Protestant Episcopal Church; consequently, it is the duty of every member of the same, as it is of all Christians, persistently and earnestly to oppose and resist the unchurching, exclusive dogma.

8th. That to those Christians who hold to Biblical, spiritual, and evangelical views of the Church of Christ, as opposed to those which are ecclesiastical, sacrificial, and legal merely, there is no difficulty in healing all divisions with respect to church orders and government.

The general acknowledgment of the historical fact that the Alexandrian Church was not epis-

copal in its consecration, and consequently in its succession, though governed by a patriarch, while the churches of Antioch and Rome were possibly so, and all the churches, by common agreement, soon after the Apostles, under the superintendence of bishops, by the custom of the Church, and not by divine law (as Augustine and Jerome and others directly assert), virtually settles the controversies which afflict the Church, and "Ephraim will no longer envy Judah, nor Judah vex Ephraim."

The orders, ministry, and sacraments of the Protestant Evangelical churches of England, America, and Germany, will be mutually acknowledged; the way will be opened for agreement upon the primitive basis of Episcopacy, to which happy result the claims of extreme Episcopalians have presented the most formidable obstacles.

Then the practice of reordination by the Episcopal, or any other church, will be sustained only on the grounds on which Archbishop Leighton consented to be reordained, and on which the Church of Geneva reordained those who came to them from the Church of France, as Bingham has stated — *i. e.*, that every church has an inherent right to arrange its form of ordination, and that the repetition of the rite is simply a solemn imprecation for a renewal of ministerial grace; terms similar to those upon which Bishop Heber invited the Lutheran ministers of India to con-

form to the Church of England, and the same on which Archbishop Bramhall received the conforming Presbyterian clergy of Ireland. On no other grounds can reordination be rightfully received or allowed, and those who have permitted or received it with the opposite, exclusive view have departed from the principles of the Primitive and Protestant Episcopal churches, influenced, no doubt, by the wide-spread misconceptions which have so long prevailed on this subject.

Let the view and practice of the Primitive Church be substituted for this novelty of Romish origin; let truth take the place of error; let the mistake, conscientiously made, be rectified in accordance with the facts of history, and on principles both of charity and sound policy; then the Protestant Episcopal Church will become, as she is prepared to be (instead of holding a negative and subordinate position), the Macedonian Phalanx, the Tenth Legion, the Old Guard, in the coming fierce onset upon the power of the evil spirit, the god of this world.

Such are the conclusions which we submit to the candid reader. If Jerome and Hilary, Eutychius, Severus, and Elmacinus, Whitgift and Willet, Usher and Stillingfleet, Morinus and Gibbon, were deceived; if Stanley, and Goode, and Litton, and Riddle, and Garrat, and a multitude of the most learned men of other churches, have misconceived the truth, let wiser and better

scholars give proof to this effect. Otherwise let the truth be generally received; let the one evangelical ministry be acknowledged, whether episcopal or presbyterian in its succession, both primitive and both valid, both equally blessed of the Lord, and sharing his abounding grace and favor, and let all the people say amen!

CHAPTER XI.

TESTIMONY FROM NON-EPISCOPAL STANDARD WRITERS.

As there are some who do not think episcopal ordination or consecration necessary to give value to a writer's statements, and that an author may be as learned and reliable outside the Episcopal Church as within it, we present the confirmatory evidence of a few leading non-episcopal standard historians. As these are generally text-books in most of the divinity schools in this country, it will be evident how slight is the prospect of the spread of exclusive episcopal claims among American Christians. We present as our first witness,

DR. PHILIP SCHAFF,

of the German Reformed Communion.

Dr. Schaff, who is second to no living authority on a point like this, in his "History of the Christian Church" (pp. 418, 419), thus writes: "In favor of the second view, which denies the apostolic origin of the episcopate as a separate office or order, and derives it by way of human, though natural and necessary development from the presidency of the original congregational pres-

byterate, are the following facts: The custom of the Church of Alexandria, where, from the Evangelist Mark down to the middle of the third century, the twelve presbyters elected one of their number president, and called him bishop. The fact rests on the authority of Jerome, and is confirmed independently by the annals of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius, of the tenth century. The latter states that Mark instituted in that city a patriarch (this is an anachronism) and twelve presbyters, who should fill the vacant patriarchate by electing and *ordaining* to the office one of their number, and then electing a new presbyter, so as always to retain the number twelve. He relates, moreover, that down to the time of Demetrius, at the end of the second century, there was no bishop in Egypt besides the one in Alexandria; consequently, there could have been no episcopal ordination except by going out of the province."

GIESLER.

This learned writer in his "History" (vol. i. pp. 56–65), writes: "The new churches everywhere formed themselves on the model of the mother church at Jerusalem. At the head of each were the *elders*, presbuteroi, episcopoi, all officially of equal rank, though in several instances a peculiar authority seems to have been conceded to some one individual from personal considerations." He gives the language of Jerome, and referring to

Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, remarks: 'It is remarkable how long this notion of the original sameness of bishops and presbyters was retained." He then refers to Isidore, Bernaldus, Gratian, and Lancelot, as Romanists who sustained this view, and says: "It was not till after the Reformation that this view (the original identity of bishops and presbyters) was attacked. Since this, all Catholics as well as the English Episcopalians, maintain an original difference between bishop and presbyters." . . . . "After the death of the Apostles," he continues, "and the pupils of the Apostles, to whom the general direction of the churches had been conceded, some one among the presbyters of each church was suffered gradually to take the lead in its affairs. In the same irregular way the title of episcopos, *bishop*, was appropriated to the first presbyter." To sustain this view, he quotes Ambrosiaster, about 380, Jerome, Hilary, and Eutychius, with respect to the Alexandrian Church, and remarks of this last author: "In this passage it is at least certain that the part which is contradictory to the usage of later times has not been interpolated, and so far has an historical value. Attempts have been made to explain away its evidence by Morinus, Pearson, Le Quilen, Renaudot, Petavius, and especially by Abraham Echellensis."

NEANDER.

In this author's "Church History" (vol. i. p. 190), we read: "Soon after the apostolic age, the standing office of president of the presbytery must have been formed; which president, as having preëminently the oversight over all, was designated by the special name of *episcopos*, and thus distinguished from the other presbyters. Thus the name came to be applied exclusively to this presbyter, while the name presbyter continued at first to be common to all; for the bishops as presiding presbyters, had no official character other than that of the presbyters generally. They were only *primi inter pares*. Many of the later Fathers still have a right understanding of this process of the matter. (Hilary, in ep. i. ad Timoth., c. iii.) *Omnis episcopus presbyter, non tamen omnis presbyter episcopus; hic enim episcopus est, qui inter presbyteros primus est.*

"Jerome (146, ad Evang.) says that it had been the practice of the Alexandrian Church, until the times of the bishops Hieroclas and Dionysius, in the middle of the third century, for the presbyters to choose one of their own number as a president, and call him bishop. And so also there may be some foundation of truth in the account of Eutychius, though it may not be wholly true, and must be chronologically false. This person, who was Patriarch of Alexandria in the first half of the tenth century, relates that in

the Alexandrian Church, up to the time of the Bishop Alexander, in the beginning of the fourth century, the following arrangement had existed: There was a college of twelve presbyters, one of whom presided over the rest as bishop, and these presbyters always chose their bishop out of their own number, and the rest ordained him."

HERZOG.

From this author's "Encyclopedia of Theology," edited by Dr. Bomberger, we take the following extract. Under the head "Bishop," we read: "In addition to having the general direction of affairs, the bishop early acquired authority to appoint and ordain elders. But even in this respect there was for several centuries no uniform rule; for whilst the Council of Ancyra (314) made ordination the duty of bishops of the larger cities, and forbid country bishops or presbyters to ordain, the distinction was not strictly observed in other parts of the Church. Thus, in Egypt, where to the time of the Patriarch Demetrius (190–232), there were no bishops but the one in Alexandria, and the presbyteries exercised episcopal functions still later. (See Jerome, ad Evang., Giesler, Ritchl.) The same holds of the Church in Ethiopia and Scythia."

THOMAS POWELL.

Thomas Powell, an English Wesleyan, in an

elaborate answer to Percival, republished by the Methodist Book Concern, on page 130, after quoting the statements of Jerome, with respect to the Church of Alexandria, proceeds: "Here, then, it is evident that Jerome speaks simply of the fact and custom which had then, in his day, become established as to what bishops do and presbyters may not do; not of the power or right of presbyters, or that they could not by divine right do what the bishops did. This custom, or ecclesiastical arrangement, which, for the honor of the bishop and his church, made ordination generally a prerogative of the bishop's office, Jerome advises the presbytery to comply with. Therefore, 'they may not,' because of this custom, especially without the bishop's license, ordain. Any other supposition would make Jerome contradict, in the same page, what he had most firmly maintained.

"His illustrations show the same. The custom of the Church of Alexandria was evidently intended by him as an example of ordination by presbyters; else why mention it as something which had ceased in his day to be common.

"The presbyters at Alexandria, prior to A. D. 250, elected one of themselves, placed him in the chair (all the consecration which he had), and gave him his title of bishop. It is trifling to say, as Episcopalians do, 'Perhaps there were bishops present who laid on hands and consecrated him.' This is little short of contradicting Jerome. He

certainly makes the presbyters the doers of all that was done in making the bishop. The case of the army making its general, is another instance which he mentions in illustration of his position. Every school-boy knows that the Roman army in those days frequently created their generals by acclamation; and it is to these proceedings Jerome alludes; the lawfulness of the thing was no more necessary to his argument, than the lawfulness of the unjust steward's conduct to our Lord's argument. It is the fact, and its bearing, which are important. The deacons, too, then appointed one of themselves as their head, calling him archdeacon; so the presbyters make a presbyter their head, and call him bishop. The army made the general; the deacons, the archdeacons; and the presbyters made the bishop. This is plainly the sense. Presbyters, then, ordained even bishops, in the See of Alexandria, from the time of St. Mark up to Heraclius and Dionysius, that is, for about the first two hundred years after Christ.

"Stillingfleet has, moreover, quoted, in confirmation of this view, the testimony of Eutychius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who expressly affirms," etc. . . . . "The names, it seemed, varied; the thing was the same. There never was any universally established manner of making bishops, in the Christian Church, except the Scriptural one, by which every man is made a minister

and bishop at once, by one and the same ordination."

NATHAN BANGS.

Dr. Bangs, of the same communion, in his work, "An Original Church of Christ," remarks (p. 69), after quoting Mosheim's commendations of the learned writings of Eutychius: "Here then was a patriarch living in the very place, and occupying the episcopal chairs of the very church whose annals he wrote, and which annals Mosheim tells us were extant in his time; and it is from these same annals, called by Stillingfleet, *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ* (Origin of the Alexandrian Church), which the learned Selden published in Arabic, that the above testimony is quoted. Who more likely to ascertain the facts in the case than the very man who lived, taught, and wrote in the very city and church whose annals he wrote? Had he not the most easy access to the archives of the Church whose overseer he was?

"But, says our objector, that testimony of Eutychius is not to be relied on, because he lived in the tenth century! Verily, this is an age of discovery! How long did Moses live after the events had come to pass which he narrates? Josephus must be muzzled because he happened to lived upward of four thousand of years after Adam was taken from the ground? Indeed, according to this rule, by a summary process all the historians, except those who have confined their

narratives to their own times, must pass under the knife of excision, as pseudo-annalists, and therefore worthy of death! Rollin, Hume, the authors of the 'Universal History,' Mosheim, Milner, Haweis, Gregory, Dupin, and a thousand others, must all go by the board, as unworthy of credit, because they wrote of times so long anterior to their days!

"But it is not surprising that an attempt should be made to set aside this testimony of Eutychius, for it is a death-blow to the doctrine of the essentiality of a third order to a valid ordination. And hence the most unreasonable demand, that I must prove that Eutychius did in truth express himself thus. I have produced the witness, plain, positive. Let them if they can invalidate the truth of his evidence. I have, moreover, corroborated the truth of this testimony by that of a number of others, all of whom testify to the general fact, namely, that presbyters did ordain other presbyters, and also, in many instances, superior ministers in office. Can they invalidate this testimony? They know that they cannot. I lay it down then as a principle *ab initio*, that the right of ordination was in the college of presbyters, and that they exercised when, where, and as long as they pleased; and that, whenever they were divested of it, it was either a voluntary act of their own, or was taken from them by force."

ABEL STEVENS.

Dr. Stevens, an eminent living Methodist divine, in his "Essay on Church Polity," a standard in his denomination, writes (p. 58): "The example of the Church of Alexandria furnishes a complete vindication of Mr. Wesley's ordination in the American Church." He then quotes Dr. Goode's translation of Eutychius, and gives Archbishop Usher's concession with respect to the ordination by Alexandrian presbyters. Bishop John Emory, in his "Episcopal Controversy Reviewed" (pp. 90–100), largely ventilates the subject, taking the same view.

It must be evident to all, from the extracts given from standard Methodist Divines, that exclusive Episcopacy has a poor prospect of propagating its scheme among the members of this leading denomination in our land. The success of this communion is a testimony to the efficiency of episcopal government, when adapted to the age and people where it is employed.

DR. JAMES P. WILSON.

This Presbyterian author was eminent for learning, and no less for candor. In his treatise on "The Primitive Government of Christian Churches," he takes ground against the doctrine of the lay eldership of his own communion, as well as the theory of episcopal government. Concerning Jerome's letter to Evagrius, he writes

(p. 172): "In no city was planted, by the Apostles, more than one church; this the scriptural and subsequent history of the Church demonstates. A presbytery existed in every organized Church, and no more in a city; consequently, one presiding presbyter, who afterwards, by custom, for prevention of schisms, became the bishop, belonged to each church, and consequently to every city in the age of Jerome. At the period of the forgeries, which bear the name of the pious Ignatius, parochial Episcopacy prevailed; but they betray ignorance, who affirm that presbyters were then laymen, or that such a grade is an essential characteristic of the Presbyterian Church. Seven deacons were appointed at Jerusalem; no more were ordained in Rome. This paucity, and the nature of their duties, created popularity, whilst the number of presbyters diminished their importance. Dissensions arose between these orders, and Augustine has recorded an appeal to the bishop of that metropolis, to decide between them. Probably this letter was sought and given on that occasion; or it may have been in defense of the Bishop of Rome, who was persecuted by a deacon of high rank. Though a presbyter, Jerome never officiated as such except in private lectures on part of the Scriptures, but even these were scarcely delivered by him as an officer either at Rome or Bethlehem.

"This letter could not have been the offspring of jealousy, but of regard to the truth. His language is temperate, his arguments rational, and his authorities the Scriptures; to these custom and expediency are subordinate — canons he does not even name.

"From the practice here mentioned of the Church at Alexandria, after the death of Mark, the Evangelist, the existence of Episcopacy from that period, which was apostolic, has been inferred. There could have been little difference between the state of things in apostolic times, and at the death of Mark. In both, the presbyters had their ruling elder or president; upon them custom, founded on consent, devolved the responsibility and superintendency of the presbytery, of which the Church of Alexandria furnished a proof. Jerome shows this was a human innovation, because that presbyter and bishop were originally the same office, and so regarded by Paul, Peter, and John; also, by the churches of Philippi, Ephesus, and those of Crete, and other places, each of which had been governed by the Common Council of its own presbytery.

"The election of such a presiding presbyter at Alexandria, he does not refer either to antecedent apostolic precept or example, but expressly to the presbyters themselves, whose election constituted the only disparity. Mark held the high office of evangelist, and, as such, might preside

in any church, especially of his own planting. If he supplied the place of a president, in advanced age, after his death the presbytery of Alexandria, acting as others, must have chosen one permanently, the growth of whose power afterwards kept pace with the customs of other churches. The assertion by Eutychius, A. D. 950, that the presbyters in Alexandria, from the first, ordained such bishop, is incredible. Reordination began in the Cyprianic age, and, in Jerome's day, was performed only by bishops; so, also, was the ordination of presbyters. 'What does a bishop, ordination excepted, that a presbyter may not do?' The first of these verbs denoted a present and continuous acting; the second is of the same sort, but potential, and consequently expressing a future. To imagine this spoken by Jerome, of early times, is, therefore, obviously incorrect. When he wrote, every one knew that for presbyters to ordain was contrary to the laws and canons of the Church; his proof of their original identity, from the fact that presbyters might now perform all other duties of bishops, required the exception. But every mind perceives that the establishment of the identity destroyed the originality and authority of the exception.

"Any other interpretation would unnerve his argument, produce self-contradiction, and conflict with the fact that Timothy was ordained by

a presbytery. The sameness of the office could, therefore, never be reconciled with episcopal ordination, as in this day. The confession of such an exception, if it referred to apostolical times, immediately after showing that presbyters of themselves chose, and placed in his seat, and denominated the person the Bishop of Alexandria, would betray weakness in the extreme. Although the presbyters of Alexandria officiated in their respective places in the city, they were rather a parish than a diocese, being one church, whereof they, with their bishop, who was one with themselves, constituted the presbytery -- not a church session of mute elders — every presbyter had his place of preaching in Alexandria. Had the presbyters, so chosen to preside, been ordained by presiding presbyters of cities in Palestine or Syria, instead of being an example of the introduction of the custom of devolving the responsibility and oversight, which had belonged to the presbytery, on one of their number, it would have proved the reverse, and contradicted the position that presbyter and bishop denoted at first the same office." . . . .

Page 175. "The fanciful idea of *episcopal successorship* by divine right was repugnant to the views of Jerome, who has unanswerably refuted it by numerous Scriptural testimonies, and demonstrated his meaning and consistency by asserting equally of presbyters, that they were

successors to the degree of the Apostles. '*Qui apostolico gradui succedentes*' (ad Heliodorus, tom. 1, p. 1)." Irenæus had set him examples of each long before.

"That these successors of the Apostles inherited their gifts, authority, or influence, or had any other ordination than that of their co-presbyters, prior to the Cyprianic age, has never been shown to us by credible testimony. His defense of presbyters against deacons, his use of the word presbyter without the imaginary distinction of preaching and lay elders, and his universal silence with regard to the latter, evince that Jerome had no idea of lay presbyters. He is, therefore, another 'witness against that novel order, of which not a vestige has been found in the first four centuries.'"

LYMAN COLEMAN.

This Congregational divine, in his "Apostolical and Primitive Church" (ed. 1844, p. 183), thus writes: "We have next the authority of Jerome, who died A. D. 426. He was one of the most learned of the Latin Fathers. Erasmus styles him 'by far the most learned and eloquent of all the Christians, and the prince of Christian divines.' Jerome received his education at Rome, and was familiar with the Roman, Greek, and Hebrew languages. He visited Egypt, and travelled extensively in France and the adjacent countries. He

resided in the course of his life at Constantinople, at Antioch, at Jerusalem, and at Bethlehem. By his great learning, and extensive acquaintance with all that related to the doctrines and usages both of the Eastern and of the Western Churches, he was eminently qualified to explain the rights and prerogatives of the priesthood.

"But does Jerome testify to the rights of presbyters to ordain? 'What does a bishop,' says he, 'ordination excepted, which a presbyter may not do?' This, however, is said of the relations of bishops and presbyters *as they then were*. This restriction of the right of ordaining to the bishops alone was a recent innovation, which had begun to distinguish them from the presbyters, and to subvert the original organization of the Church. But it was an acknowledged fact, in his day, that the bishops had no authority from Christ or his Apostles for their unwarranted assumptions. 'As the presbyters know that it is by *the custom of the Church* that they are subject to him who is placed over them, so let the bishops know that they are above presbyters rather by the custom of the Church, than by the fact of our Lord's appointment, and that they (both bishops and presbyters) ought to rule the Church in common, in imitation of the example of Moses.'

"He reviews the same subject with great point in his famous epistle to Evagrius, or more properly, in modern editions, to Evangelus. He re-

bukes with great severity certain persons who had preferred deacons in honor 'above *presbyters*, i. e. *bishops*.' Having thus asserted the identity of bishops and presbyters, he goes on to prove his position from Phil. i. 1, from Acts xx. 17, 28, from Titus i. 5, from 1 Tim. iv. 14, and from 1 Pet. v. 1. 'Does the testimony of these men seem of small account to you?' he proceeds to say; 'then clangs the gospel trumpet, — that son of thunder whom Jesus so much loved, and who drank at the fountain of truth from the Saviour's breast, — "the *presbyter* to the elect lady and her children," 2 John i. 1; and in another Epistle, "the *presbyter* to the well beloved Gaius," 3 John i. 1.'" Then quoting the passage with reference to the Alexandrian Church, Mr. Coleman proceeds: "Here the presbyters themselves elect one of their number and make him bishop, so that even the bishop himself is ordained by the presbyters, if indeed it can be called an *ordination;* if not, then he is only a presbyter still, having no other right to ordain than they themselves have. Such, Jerome assumes, is the usage '*in every country*.' There was but one ordination for bishops and presbyters in his time, though bishops had now begun exclusively to administer it. But we have a stream of testimonies coming down to us from the time of the Apostles, that it had been the custom of the Church from the beginning, for bishops and presbyters to receive the same ordi-

nation. This is another consideration of much importance to show that presbyters were entitled to ordain. Having themselves received episcopal ordination, as truly as the bishops, they were equally qualified to administer the same.

"But Jerome himself attributes to presbyters the original rights of ordination. 'Priests who baptize, and administer the Eucharist, anoint with oil, impose hands, instruct catechumens, constitute Levites and others priests, have less reason to take offense at us, explaining these things, or at the prophets foretelling them, than to ask of the Lord forgiveness.'

"The relevancy of this passage depends upon the question, who are the *sacerdotes*, priests, of whom Jerome speaks? He is commenting upon Zephaniah iii. 3: 'Her *princes* within her are roaring lions,' by which he understands her *priests*, saying, 'I am aware that I shall offend many because I interpret these things as said of bishops and presbyters.' Then, after remarking, at length, upon this degenerate priesthood, he adds the sentence above. Jerome, therefore, ascribes to presbyters and bishops alike the same rights to constitute 'Levites and others priests,' applying the terms not to the Jewish priesthood, but to the clergy of the Christian Church in his day, and including both bishops and presbyters in the same category, as possessing equal rights to baptize, to ordain, and to administer the sacraments.

"That the right of ordination belonged to presbyters is evident from the authority of Eutychius, of Alexandria, the most distinguished writer among the Arabian Christians of the tenth century. His authority confirms the testimony of Jerome, while it illustrates more clearly the usage of the Church in Egypt. The citation, with the translation, is from Goode." This author then gives the extract from Eutychius with Dr. Goode's comments.

Neander, who indorses Dr. Coleman's work, in his introduction, thus speaks of episcopal government: "This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purity of the Christian spirit. When, however, the doctrine, as it gradually gained currency in the third century, that the bishops are, by divine right, the head of the Church, and invested with the government of the same; that they are the successors of the Apostles, and by this succession inherit apostolical authority; that they are the medium through which, in consequence of that ordination which they have received, merely in an outward manner, the Holy Ghost, in all time to come, must be transmitted to the Church, — when this becomes the doctrine of the Church, we certainly must perceive in these assumptions a strong corruption of the purity of

the Christian system. It is a carnal perversion of the true idea of the Christian Church. It is a falling back into the spirit of the Jewish religion. Instead of the Christian idea of a church, based on inward principles of communion, and extending itself by means of these, it presents us with the image of one like that under the Old Testament, resting on outward ordinances, and by external rites seeking to promote the propagation of the Kingdom of God. This entire perversion of the original view of the Christian Church was itself the origin of the above system of the Roman Catholic religion — the germ from which sprung the Popery of the Dark Ages.

"We hold indeed no controversy with that class of Episcopalians who adhere to the episcopal system above mentioned as well adapted, in their opinion, to the exigencies of their Church. We would live in harmony with them, notwithstanding their mistaken views of the true form of the Church, provided they denounce not other systems of church government. But the doctrine of the absolute necessity of the episcopal as the only valid form of church government, and of the episcopal succession of bishops above mentioned, in order to participation in the gifts of the Spirit, all this we must regard as something foreign to the true idea of the Christian Church. It is in direct conflict with the spirit of Protestantism; and is the origin, not of the true catholicism

of the Apostles, but of that of the Romish Church. When, therefore, Episcopalians disown, as essentially deficient in their ecclesiastical organization, other Protestant churches which evidently have the spirit of Christ, it only remains for us to protest, in the strongest terms, against their setting up such a standard of perfection for the Christian Church. Far be it from us who began with Luther in the spirit, that we should now desire to be made perfect by the flesh." Gal. iii. 3.

DR. JOHN CUMMING.

Dr. Cumming, in his "Lectures on Romanism" (p. 163), writes: "Let me now proceed to show you, by two simple statements, what is really understood by apostolical succession. It is, in the first place, supposed that each bishop has been consecrated by his contemporary bishops, on the death of his predecessor, and that no one link in the long line of successive consecrators or consecrations is wanting between Dr. Bird Sumner, the present excellent Archbishop of Canterbury, and St. Peter, St. Timothy, or St. Paul.

"The second position is, that ordination performed by successive bishops only, is valid, and that the party obtaining this ordination thereby eceives all the gifts and grace of the Spirit, by which his act and deed give vitality and virtue to every sacrament and ordinance he administers.

These are the two great positions of those who advocate what is called the apostolical succession. The simplest illustration of it that I can give you, would be a long magnetic, galvanic, or electric chain, starting at the foot of an apostle, and extending downward to the present Primate of all England; to the first link of which was imparted a mysterious and subtle element or virtue, which has been transmitted by successive consecrations, link by link, parallel with the plane of the earth, until it has reached the bishops of the present day, on whose heads, as in reservoirs, it is condensed and ready for use and transmission to their successors.

"Now, you will see at once, that if the first link in a long chain is wanting, the whole falls to the ground; or if twenty links in the middle of a chain are wanting, the whole falls to the ground; or if, in this electric chain of which I have been speaking, some links in the middle, instead of being veritable conductors of the mysterious virtue, are incapable of transmitting it, or are so vitiated that the current must fly off by a centrifugal force, then, again, the transmission is arrested and dissipated, and all *post et propter hoc* is vitiated. In all these respects I am ready to prove, that the apostolical succession belongs to those things called 'endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying.'

"Now, I will show you, that in the far stretching chain of succession to the Apostles, the very first link after the Apostles is wanting.

"My proof, on this point, is drawn from the recorded state of the see (using the word in the ancient sense), or bishopric, or oversight, or by whatever equally suitable name it may be called, of Alexandria. Eutychius, of Alexandria, states that St. Mark, the Evangelist, first of all preached the gospel in Alexandria."

After quoting the language of Eutychius, Dr. Cumming proceeds: "It is here distinctly declared, that during the three hundred years that preceded the Council of Nice — that is, up to 325 — the custom in Alexandria was, not for other bishops to consecrate the bishop that was to be the head of the diocese, but for the twelve presbyters to meet together and choose one of themselves as chairman, or moderator, or patriarch, and their choice and designation, without any consecration by a bishop, was *ipso facto et de jure* the appointment of that bishop. This is utterly opposed to recent views, and, even on moderate Episcopal principles, it is irregular at least.

"If all the presbyters of London were to meet together at the death of the Bishop of London, and to elect one of themselves as bishop and consecrate him, every Tractarian would protest against it as a departure from the vital laws of

the Church, and an utter interruption and destruction of the succession, and such a person would be pronounced to be no more bishop than I should be held to be their diocesan by the same party.

"But if it be the fact, that the presbyters thus originally constituted their bishops in so great a see, and if it be a fact, also, that there is no transmission of the apostolical succession where there is no consecration by bishops, then I ask, Can any one of the present bishops of the English Church prove that his succession and consecration may not be derived from some of the elected said bishops, who were merely non-consecrated presbyters of Alexandria, and so, after all, be null on Tractarian principles, however sound and admissible on ours? Sure we are there is a risk of some non-conducting link being introduced into a chain, during these three hundred years, when a custom prevailed in so important and influential a diocese, so opposite to that which is now thought essential."

After quoting the confirmatory statements of Severus and Jerome, our author proceeds: "These collateral witnesses prove, equally, that the custom existed at Alexandria of the presbyters consecrating or ordering their bishops. And if this be the fact (and we have the best of all demonstration of it, because it is proved by the very witnesses to whom the tractators appeal), then, we

repeat it, as the appointment of presbyters was the only consecration that was had in that city during three centuries, the element which, upon Tractarian principles, is essential to the transmission of the succession, was altogether wanting, and this vicious procedure may have infected all parts of the Church."

DR. W. D. KILLEN.

Professor Killen, of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, in his interesting work on the "Ancient Church for the First Three Hundred Years" (p. 580), writes: "It is clear, from the New Testament, that in the apostolic age ordination was performed by 'the laying on of hands of the presbytery,' and this mode of designation to the ministry appears to have continued until some time in the third century. We are informed by the most learned of the Fathers, in a passage to which the attention of the reader has been already invited, that 'even at Alexandria,' etc. . . . (p. 533).

"As Jerome here mentions various important facts of which we might otherwise have remained ignorant, and as this statement throws much light upon the ecclesiastical history of the early Church, it is entitled to special notice.

"In the letter where this passage occurs, the writer is extolling the dignity of presbyters, and is endeavoring to show that they are very little

inferior to bishops. He admits, indeed, that, in his own days, they had ceased to ordain; but he intimates that they once possessed the right, and that they retained it in all its integrity until the former part of the preceding century. Some have thought that Jerome has here expressed himself indefinitely, and that he did not know the exact date at which the arrangement he describes ceased at Alexandria. But his testimony, when fairly analyzed, can scarcely be said to want precision, for he obviously speaks of Heraclas and Dionysius as bishops *by anticipation*, alleging that a custom, which anciently existed among the elders of the Egyptian metropolis, was maintained until the time when these ecclesiastics, who afterwards successively occupied the episcopal chair, sat together in the presbytery.

"The period thus pointed out can be easily ascertained. Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, after a long official life of forty-three years, died about A. D. 232, and it is well known that Heraclas and Dionysius were both members of his presbytery towards the close of his episcopal administration. It was, therefore, shortly before his demise that the new system was introduced. In certain parts of the Church the arrangement mentioned by Jerome probably continued somewhat longer. Cyprian apparently hinted at such cases of exception when he says, that in '*almost* all the provinces,' *apud nos quoque et fere per*

provincias universas tenetur (Epist. 68), the neighboring bishops assembled, on the occasion of an episcopal vacancy, at the new election and ordination. It may have been that, in a few of the more considerable towns, the elders still continued to nominate their president.

"When the erudite Roman presbyter informs us that '*even* at Alexandria,' *nam et Alexandriæ*, the elders formerly made their own bishop, his language obviously implies that such a mode of creating the chief pastor was not confined to the church of the metropolis of Egypt. It existed wherever Christianity had gained a footing, and he mentions this particular see, partly, because of its importance, being, in point of rank, the second in the empire, and partly, perhaps, because the remarkable circumstances in its history, leading to the alteration which he specifies, were known to all his well-informed contemporaries.

"Jerome does not say that the Alexandrian presbyters inducted their bishop by imposition of hands, or set him apart to the office by any formal ordination.

"Eutychius, the celebrated Patriarch of Alexandria, who flourished at the beginning of the tenth century, makes this assertion. According to this writer there were originally twelve presbyters connected with the Alexandrian Church; and when the patriarchate became vacant, they elected one of the twelve presbyters, *on whose head the re-*

maining eleven laid hands, and blessed him and created him patriarch. (See the original passage in Selden's works, ii. c. 421, 422: London, 1726.)

This passage furnishes a remarkable confirmation of the testimony of Jerome, as to the fact that the Alexandrian presbyters originally made their bishops, but it is probably not very accurate as to the details. As to the laying on of hands, it is not supported by Jerome.

"His words apparently indicated that they did not recognize the necessity of any special need of investiture; that they made the bishop by election; and that, when once acknowledged as the object of their choice, he was at liberty to enter forthwith on the performance of his episcopal duties. When the Roman soldiers made an emperor, they appointed him by acclamation, and the cheers which issued from their ranks as he stood up before the legions, and as he was clothed with purple by one of themselves, constituted the ceremony of his inauguration. The ancient archdeacon was still one of the deacons (the case is different with the modern English archdeacon who is a presbyter): as he was the chief almoner of the Church, he required to possess tact, discernment, and activity; and, in the fourth century, he was nominated to the office by his fellow-deacons. Jerome assures us, that until the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, the elders made a bishop just in the same way as in his own day

the soldiers made an emperor, or as the deacons chose one whom they knew to be industrious, and made him an archdeacon."

After quoting from the letters of Pius, Bishop of Rome, to Justus of Vienne, and of Irenæus to Victor of Rome, in support of Jerome's statement, our author proceeds: "Some imagine that no one can be properly qualified to administer divine ordinances who has not received episcopal ordination, but a more accurate acquaintance with the history of the early Church is all that is required to dissipate the delusion. The preceding statement clearly shows that for upwards of a hundred and fifty years after the death of our Lord, all the Christian ministers throughout the world were ordained by presbyters. The bishops themselves were of 'the order of the presbytery,' and as they had never received episcopal consecration, they could only ordain as presbyters. The bishop was, in fact, nothing more than the chief presbyter. Thus the author of the 'Questions on the Old and New Testament,' says: '*Quiæ est episcopus nisi primus presbyter*,' c. 101."

A Father of the third century accordingly observes: "All power and grace are established in the church where *elders preside*, who possess the power as well of baptizing, as of confirming and ordaining." "*Omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia constituta sit, ubi præsident majores natu, qui et*

baptizendi et manum imponendi et ordinandi" (Firmilian, Epist. Cyprian, "Opera," p. 304).

(Firmilian was Bishop of Cappadocia, in Asia Minor, an intimate friend of Origen, who passed much time with him, and who shared with him his freedom from ecclesiasticism; Origen having preached the gospel as a layman for many years, receiving orders at a late period in life.)

Dr. Killen continues: "An old ecclesiastical law, recently presented for the first time to the English reader (see Bunsen's 'Hippolytus,' ii. 351–7), throws much light on a portion of the history of the church long buried in great obscurity. This law may well remind us of those remains of extinct classes of animals which the naturalist studies with so much interest, as it obviously belongs to an era even anterior to that of the so-called apostolical canons (probably framed only a few years before the middle of the third century, and called apostolical, perhaps, because concocted by some of the bishops of the so-called apostolic churches).

"Though it is a part of a series of regulations once current in the Church of Ethiopia, there is every reason to believe that it was framed in Italy, and that its authority was acknowledged by the Church of Rome in the time of Hippolytus. The canons edited by Hippolytus were, no doubt, at one time acknowledged by the Western Church. It marks a transition period in the history of ec-

clesiastical polity, and whilst it indirectly confirms the testimony of Jerome, relative to the custom of the Church of Alexandria, it shows that the state of things to which the learned presbyter refers, was now superseded by another arrangement.

"This curious specimen of ancient legislation treats of the appointment and ordination of ministers. 'The bishop,' says this enactment, 'is to be elected by all the people. . . . . And they shall choose ONE OF THE BISHOPS AND ONE OF THE PRESBYTERS, ... AND THESE SHALL LAY THEIR HANDS UPON HIS HEAD AND PRAY' (Bunsen's 'Hippolytus,' iii. 43).

"Here, to avoid the confusion of a whole crowd of individuals imposing hands on ordination, two were selected to act on behalf of the assembled office-bearers; and, that the parties entitled to officiate might be fairly represented, the deputies were to be a bishop and a presbyter.

"Eutychius intimates that the Alexandrian presbyters continued to ordain their own bishops till the time of the Council of Nice. It is not improbable that, until then, some of them may have continued to take part in the ordination, and his statements may be so far correct.

"The canon (of Hippolytus) illustrates the jealousy with which the presbyters, in the early part of the third century, still guarded some of their rights and privileges. In the matter of investing

others with church authority, they yet maintained their original position, and though many bishops might be present when another was inducted into office, they would permit only one of the number to unite with themselves in the ceremony of ordination. Some at the present day do not hesitate to assert that presbyters have no right whatever to ordain; but this canon supplies evidence, that in the third century they were employed to ordain bishops."

REV. JOHN BROWN, D. D.

Dr. Brown, of Scotland, in his "Letters to Dr. Pusey" (p. 224), writes: "But passing from your Church, I would further remark, that the succession must have been injured in all those instances in which bishops and presbyters were not only baptized, but *were ordained by presbyters*, and were not reordained. Now that this was the case from the earliest ages is beyond a doubt. It was the case in the important see of Alexandria, when, as Usher stated to Charles I., upon the authority of Jerome and Eutychius, the presbyters for a long time made not only presbyters but bishops. 'For even from Mark the Evangelist,' says the first of these authors, etc.

"Upon which Willet, as was noticed formerly, remarks: 'So it would seem that the very election of a bishop in those days, without any other circumstances, was his ordination.' And says

Stillingfleet, who answers at considerable length the numerous objections urged by Bishop Pearson, to this interpretation of the passage: 'It appears that by election, he means *conferring authority*, by the instances he brings to that purpose; as the Roman armies choosing their emperor, who had no other power but what they received by the length of the sword, and the deacons choosing their archdeacon, who had no other power but what was merely conferred by the choice of the college of deacons' ('Irenicum,' p. 274).

"And says Eutychius, who is represented by Ebn Abi Osbæ, as a 'man well acquainted with the sciences and institutions which were in use among the Christians,' and whose testimony coincides with that of Jerome, 'Hananias was the first of the patriarchs who was set over the Church of Alexandria,' etc.

"And as it was obvious that he could have no inducements to make this statement, but a regard to truth, because, as he himself was a patriarch, it was fitted to lessen the respectability of the ruler, inasmuch as it showed a deviation from the mode of creating the patriarchs, which had been recommended by the Evangelist; and as it is confirmed by Jerome, who was born only *about eighty years* after the change took place, and who had the best opportunities to become acquainted with the fact, as he lived much in the East, it is

perfectly capricious on the part of Episcopalians to question their testimony.

"Usher, who was one of the most able and learned of their bishops, examined the evidence of former times with the utmost care, and declared himself to be satisfied, and there appears to be no good reason why it ought not to satisfy them now. If they have perfect confidence in the lists of bishops of some of the churches given by Eusebius, though he lived *nearly three hundred years* after the time when they commenced, nothing but a conviction that it bears so strongly against diocesan Episcopacy and the apostolical succession, could prompt them to doubt the statements of Jerome, who lived *so much nearer to the event* which he reports, corroborated as it is by another individual who himself presided over the see of Alexandria, and might have access to its records, and who will be acknowledged at least to be an impartial witness.

"But if the bishops of Alexandria, as Usher affirmed, *for two hundred and fifty years*, were made by presbyters, either by election without ordination, or by their laying their hands on their heads, and setting them apart to their office, I would like to be informed whether the succession must not have been broken even at the very beginning, during that long period.

"And as Alexandria was one of the largest and most populous bishoprics in the early

Church, I shall leave it to any candid individual to say whether he can estimate the amount of the disorder and confusion which may have been introduced into other sections of the Christian Church, by clergymen coming into them, whose orders, upon your principles, must have been irregular and invalid."

On page 361, he adds: "I have only further to remark, on the statements of Jerome, that in the only instance which he mentions of the appointment of bishops, after they were first introduced, that of the bishops of Alexandria, he represents them as made by presbyters, just as the Roman army made their emperor, and the deacons made their archdeacon. He does not say whether they ordained them, though this is asserted afterwards by Eutychius. And it is evident that if they were ordained, they alone must have performed it; for before diocesan bishops were adopted by the Church, who did not receive their office by any divine appointment, but by mere human arrangement, there could be none but presbyters to consecrate those who were raised to the episcopate, not only in the Church of Alexandria, but in all the churches.

"But if, according to Jerome, it was presbyters alone who began the succession, and ordained the first diocesan bishop in all the churches, from whom the whole of the bishops of the present day, and the whole of their clergy have derived

their order, the succession has been vitiated at the very commencement, and cannot be rectified; and if presbyterian orders have no validity, there cannot, on your principles, be a church, or a minister, or a single individual who has any revealed or covenanted title to salvation on the face of the earth."

DR. GEORGE CAMPBELL.

Professor Campbell, of Marischal College, Aberdeen, in his "Lectures on Ecclesiastical History" (p. 130), thus writes: "Another witness whom I shall adduce is Jerome, who wrote about the end of the fourth century, and the beginning of the fifth. The testimony which I shall bring from him regards the practice that had long subsisted at Alexandria. I shall give you the passage in his own words, from the Epistle to Evagrius, 'Alexandriæ a Marco,' etc.

"I know it has been said that this relates only to the election of the Bishop of Alexandria, and not to his ordination. To me, it is manifest that it relates to both; or, to express myself with greater precision, it was the intention of the father to signify, that no other ordination than this election, and those ceremonies with which the presbyters might please to accompany it, such as the installment and salutation, was then and there thought necessary to one who had been ordained a presbyter before; that, according to the usage of that Church, this form was all that was requi-

site to constitute one of the presbyters their bishop. But, as I am sensible that unsupported assertions are entitled to no regard on either side, I shall assign my reasons from the author's own words, and then leave every one to judge for himself.

"Jerome, in the preceding part of this letter, had been maintaining, in opposition to some deacon who had foolishly boasted of the order of deacons as being superior to the order of presbyters: Jerome, I say, had been maintaining, that in the original and apostolical constitution of the Church, bishop and presbyter were two names for the same office. That ye may be satisfied that what he says implies no less, I shall give it you in his own words: '*Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut diaconas presbyteris, id est episcopis, anteferret. Nam, cum apostolus perspicue doceat eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos, quid patitur mensarum et viduarum minister, ut supra eos, se tumidus efferat.*'

"For this purpose he had, in a cursory manner, pointed out some of those arguments from the New Testament, which I took occasion, in a former discourse, to illustrate. In regard to the introduction of the episcopal order, as then commonly understood, in contradistinction to that of presbyter, he signifies that it did not exist from the beginning, but was merely an expedient devised after the times of the Apostles, in order the more effectually to preserve unity in every church;

as, in case of difference among the pastors, it would be of importance to have one acknowledged superior in whose determination they were bound to acquiesce. His words are, '*Quod ante postea*;' he had been speaking immediately before of the times of the Apostles: '*unus electus est, qui cæteris preponeretur, in schismatis remedium factus est, ne unus quisque ad se trahens, Christi ecclesiam rumperet.*' Then follows the passage, quoted above, concerning the Church of Alexandria.

"Nothing can be plainer than that he is giving an account of the first introduction of the episcopate (as the word was then understood), which he had been maintaining was not a different order from that of presbyter, but merely a certain preeminence conferred by election, for the expedient purpose of preventing schism. And in confirmation of what he had advanced, that this election was all that at first was requisite, he tells the story of the manner that had long been practiced, and held sufficient for constituting a bishop in the metropolis of Egypt. It is accordingly introduced thus: '*Nam et Alexandriæ*,' as a case entirely opposite, to wit, an instance of a church in which a simple election had continued to be accounted sufficient for a longer time than in other churches; an instance which had remained a vestige and an evidence of the once universal practice.

"Now, if he meant only to tell us, as some

would have it, that there the election of the bishop was in the presbyters, there was no occasion to refer to Alexandria for an example, or to a former period, as that continued to be a very common, if not the general, practice throughout the Church. And though it be allowed to have been still the custom in most places to get also the concurrence or consent of the people, this shows more strongly how frivolous the arguments from their being electors would have been in favor of presbyters as equal in point of order to bishops, and consequently superior to deacons; since, in regard to most places, as much as this could be said concerning those who are inferior to deacons, the very meanest of the people, who had all a suffrage in the election of their bishop.

"But, understood in the way I have explained it, the argument has both sense and strength in it, and is, in effect, as follows: 'There can be no essential difference between the order of bishop and that of presbyter, since, to make a bishop, nothing more was necessary at first (and of this practice the Church of Alexandria long remained an example) than the nomination of his fellow-presbyters; and no ceremony of consecration was required but what was performed by them, and consisted chiefly in placing him in a higher seat and saluting him bishop.'

"Was ever anything more frivolous than Pearson's criticism on the distinction between *a se* and

ex se? the phrase used in the above quotation ('Vindiciæ Ignatianæ,' p. 1. c. x.). Or could anything be conceived more foreign to Jerome's purpose than the above passage has thought fit to interpret it?

"Add to this, that the very examples this father makes use of for illustration, show manifestly that his meaning must have been as I have represented it. His first instance is the election of an emperor by the army, which he calls expressly making an emperor. And is it not a matter of public notoriety, that the emperors raised in this manner did, from that moment, without waiting any other inauguration, assume the imperial titles and exercise the imperial power? And did they not treat all as rebels who opposed them?

"If possible, the other example is still more decisive. To constitute an archdeacon, in the sense in which the word was then used, no other form of investiture was necessary but his election, which was in Jerome's time solely in the fellow-deacons; though this also, with many other things, came afterwards into the hands of the bishop. By this example, he also very plainly acquaints us that the bishop originally stood in the same relation to the presbyters, in which the archdeacon in his own time, did to the other deacons, and was, by consequence, no other than what the arch-presbyter came to be among the presbyters.

"But does not Jerome, after all, admit, in the

very next sentence, the superiority of bishops in the exclusive privilege of ordaining? True; he admits it as a distinction that then actually obtained; but the whole preceding part of the letter was written to evince that from the beginning it was not so.

"From ancient times he descends to times then modern, and from distant countries he comes to his own, concluding that still there was not one article of moment whereby their powers were discriminated: '*Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?*' This, indeed, proves sufficiently, that at that time presbyters were not allowed to ordain. But it can prove nothing more; for in regard to his sentiment about the rise of this difference, it was impossible to be more explicit than he had been through the whole epistle. I shall only add, that, for my part, I cannot conceive another interpretation that can give either weight to his argument or consistency to his words. The interpretation I have given does both, and that without any violence to the expression.

"I might plead Jerome's opinion in the case. I do plead only his testimony. I say I might plead his opinion as the opinion of one who lived in an age when the investigation of the origin of any ecclesiastical order or custom must have been incomparably easier than it can be to us at this distance of time. I might plead his opinion as

the opinion of a man who had more erudition than any person then in the Church, the greatest linguist, the greatest critic, the greatest antiquary of them all. But I am no friend to an implicit deference to human authority in matters of opinion.

"Let his sentiment be no further regarded than the reasons by which they are supported are found to be good. I do plead only his testimony as a testimony in relation to a matter of fact, both recent and notorious, since it regarded the then late uniform practice of the Church of Alexandria, a city which, before Constantinople became the seat of empire, was, next to Rome, the most eminent in the Christian world.

"To the same purpose the testimony of the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychius has been pleaded, who, in his 'Annals' of that Church, takes notice of this same practice, but with greater particularity of circumstances than had been done by Jerome. Eutychius tells us that the number of presbyters therein was always twelve; and that, on an occasion of vacancy in the episcopal chair, they chose one of themselves, whom the remaining eleven ordained bishop by imposition of hands and benediction. In these points, it is evident there is nothing that can be said to contradict the testimony of Jerome; all that can be affirmed is, that the one mentions particulars about which the other had been silent.

"But it will be said there is one circumstance —the duration assigned to this custom — wherein there seems to be a real contradiction. Jerome brings it no farther down than Heraclas and Dionysius; whereas Eutychius represents it as continuing to the time of Alexander, about fifty years later. Now, it is not impossible that a circumstantial custom might have been in part abolished at one time, and in part at another. But admit that in this point the two testimonies are contradictory, that will by no means invalidate their credibility as to those points on which they are agreed. The difference, on the contrary, as it is an evidence that the last did not copy from the first, and that they are therefore two witnesses and not one, seems rather as a confirmation of the truth of those articles wherein they concur. And this is our ordinary method of judging in all matters depending on human testimony. That Jerome, who probably spoke from memory, though certain as to the main points, might be somewhat doubtful as to the precise time of the abolition of the custom, is rendered even probable by his mentioning, with a view to mark the expiration of the practice, two successive bishops rather than one. For if he had known certainly that it ended with Heraclas, there would have been no occasion to mention Dionysius; and if he had been assured of its continuance to the time of Dionysius, there would have been no propriety in mentioning Heraclas."

(RICHARD BAXTER (died 1691).

This eminently learned controversial writer in his "Jesuit Juggling" (Am. ed., 1835, p. 205, chap. xxiv.: on "Evangelical Lawful Ministry,)" in reply to the claim of the Roman Church, "that they only have a true ministry or priesthood and an apostolical episcopacy and true ordination, and that we and all other Protestant churches have no true ministers, but are mere laymen under the name of ministers, because we have no just ordination," thus argues: "What succession of episcopal consecration was there in the Church of Alexandria, when Jerome (Epist. ad Evagrium) tells us, 'At Alexandria, from Mark,' etc. — . . . .

"Thus Jerome shows that bishops were then made by presbyters. In the same epistle he proves from Scripture that presbyters and bishops were one.

"Medina, accusing Jerome of error, saith that Ambrose, Austin, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, and Theophylact were in the same heresy as Bellarmin himself reporteth him. So that presbyters now may make bishops as those of Alexandria did. Jerome there saith: 'All are the successors of the Apostles.' Yet apostles as apostles have no successors, as Bellarmin teacheth (lib. 4, 'de Pontif.' cap. 25). . . . .

"5. He that is ordained according to the Apos-

tles' directions or prescripts of Scripture, hath the true apostolical ordination; but so are we ordained. The Apostles never confined ordination to those prelates that depend on the Pope of Rome. The bishops to whom the Apostles committed that power, are the same who are called presbyters by them, and they were the overseers or pastors, each but of one single church, and not of many churches, in Scripture times, so Hammond asserts. Such are those ordained among us now.

"Gregory Nazianzen, 'Orat.' 18, saith: 'I would there was no presidency nor prerogative of place and tyrannical privileges, that so we might be known only by virtue. But now this right side and left side, and middle and lower degree, and presidency and concomitancy, have begot us many constitutions to no purpose, and have driven many into the ditch, and have led them away to the region of the goats.'

"Isidore Pelusiat, lib. 3, 'Epist. 223, ad Hieracem,' saith: 'When I have showed what difference there is between the ancient ministry and the present tyranny, why do you not crown and praise the lovers of equality?'

"Refer to Sedulius, Anselm, Beda, Alcuin, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and Wickliffe's argument on the Waldenses.

"Cassander ('Consult.' article 14) saith: 'It is agreed among all, that of old, in the Apostles'

days, there was no difference between bishops and presbyters, but afterwards, for order's sake and the avoiding of schism, the bishop was set before the presbyter.' Occam determineth, that by Christ's institution all the priests of what degree soever are of equal authority, power, and jurisdiction. Reynold Peacock wrote a book 'De Ministrorum Æqualitate,' which your party caused to be printed."

"Richard Armachan (liber 9, cap. 5, 'ad Quæst. Armen.') saith: 'There is not found in the evangelical or apostolical Scriptures, any difference between bishops and simple priests called presbyters; whence it follows, that there is one power in all, and equal from their order. Cap. 7, answering the question whether any priest may consecrate churches, etc., he saith, 'Priests may do it as well as bishops, seeing a bishop hath no more in such matters than any simple priest. It seems, therefore, that the restriction of the priest's power was not in the primitive church according to Scripture.'

"6. The chief error of the Papists in this cause is expressed in their reason, 'no man can give the power which he hath not;' wherein they intimate that it is man that giveth the ministerial power; whereas it is the gift of Christ alone. Man doth but design the person that shall receive it, and then Christ giveth it, by this law, to the person so designed; and then man doth invest him, and sol-

emnize his introduction. As a woman may choose her husband, but it is not she that giveth him the power over her, but God who determineth of that power by his law, affixing it to the person chosen by her, and her action is but a condition or cause of that capacity of the matter to receive the form. Men do but obey God, in a right choice and designation of the person; his law doth presently give him the power, with which for order's sake he must be in solemn manner invested. But matters of order may possibly vary; and though they are to be observed as far as may be, yet they always give place to the end and substance of the work for ordering whereof they are appointed."

In this latter statement Baxter has shown the fallacy of our exclusive Episcopal writers. These have inverted the Scriptural doctrine, giving prominence to the human investiture of office, and depreciating the Spirit's work in the selection of the bishop, in answer to the prayers of his electors. Like other human perversions, the Church has sadly suffered, and the cause of Christ's kingdom been greatly hindered.

RICHARD HOOKER (died 1600).

This justly celebrated divine refers to the statements of Jerome with regard to the Church of Alexandria. He does not object to his testimony as to the presbyters making the bishop by election.

He simply argues this point: "We cannot with any truth so interpret his words as to mean, that in the Church of Alexandria there had been bishops endowed with superiority over presbyters from St. Mark's time only till the time of Heraclas and Dionysius."

He attempts to reply to the assertion of Jerome, that the authority of bishops over presbyters arose from custom, and not from divine arrangement.

He is not pleased with his own argument. He remarks: "This answer to Jerome seemeth dangerous. I have qualified it, as I may, by addition of some words of restraint; yet I satisfy not myself; in my judgment it should be altered."

These words of Hooker appear to have been placed by him in the margin, and afterwards inserted in the text by his editor, Dr. Gauden.

In the same fifth chapter of Book Seventh, after a consideration of Jerome's language, he concludes: "Wherefore, lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had authority to touch their estates, let them bear continually in mind, that it is rather the force of custom whereby the Church having so long found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honor them in that respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be showed, by the evidence whereof it may of truth appear that the Lord Himself hath appointed presbyters forever to be under the regi-

ment of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves. Let this consideration be a bridle unto them, and let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters, but to use their authority with so much the greater humility and moderation, as a sword which the Church hath power to take from them."

After discussing the arguments for and against episcopal government, in his fourteenth chapter he writes: "Now, whereas, hereupon some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination by others before them till we come to the very Apostles of Christ themselves. . . . . To this we answer there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop."

Here Hooker concedes the main point, and justifies the action of his Church, through his whole life. If in the heat of argument with the Puritans he has used stronger language with respect to the authority of Episcopacy, it is an inconsistency necessarily connected with his position, and a difficulty which all encounter who are led to assert a *jure divino* claim for the superiority of bishops over presbyters, or to assert the necessity of an episcopal consecration to confer the right to ordain. If the great Hooker stumbled, who now can succeed in the attempt? Yet Hooker's claims are moderate, in contrast with modern pretensions.

BISHOP HOADLEY (died 1761).

Bishop Hoadley, in his "Brief Defense of Episcopal Ordination," argues for such ordination, on the ground that it was the "will of the Apostles" and "the settled method of the Church." He advocates it on the ground of "order, decency, and regularity," — not of "indispensable necessity." The ability and moderation of his work justly entitle him to the encomium passed by Bishop White in "The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered" (p. 17). "The name of Bishop Hoadley will probably be as long remembered as any on the list of British worthies; and will never be mentioned without veneration of the strength of his abilities, the liberality of his sentiments, and his enlightened zeal for civil liberty. He has written in defense of episcopal government with more argument and better temper than is commonly to be met with in controversial writings. This amiable prelate expresses himself as follows," etc.

From the case of the Church of Alexandria, as stated by Jerome, Bishop Hoadley derives a strong argument for episcopal ordination.

His argument is as follows (p. 418): "First he saith, that in some parts of the Christian Church it is not very difficult to fix the time of this restraint upon presbyters. The only instance he produceth is that of the Church of Alexandria, in which he saith, St. Jerome tells us that for above two hun-

dred years the presbyters chose and set apart their bishops. From whence he argues that if presbyters in this Church of Alexandria invested and conferred power and authority on their bishops, and the validity of this act of theirs remained unquestionable, much more might they confer order on presbyters.

"And, lest there should not appear reason enough in the argument itself, he adds, that this argument Mr. Baxter often tells us was esteemed unanswerable by as great a man as Archbishop Usher (p. 100). I have often told this author how little I am moved with great names in matters of judgment; nor will he, I well know, yield to the force of every argument (in other points) which Archbishop Usher thought unanswerable. And therefore I hope he will give me leave freely to examine the force of this argument. For I am so far from thinking it unanswerable, that I cannot help thinking it will be found to prove the very contrary to the design of this author in alleging it. For,

"1st. Either this bishop whom the presbyters of Alexandria constituted from the very time of St. Mark the Evangelist, to the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, was no more than a prime-presbyter, or president of the council of presbyters, or he was bishop in the peculiar sense of the word. If he were more than a prime-presbyter, it will not follow that because they chose their own presi-

dent, therefore much more might they ordain other presbyters, which is the argument here used. For it is a much less thing for persons of the same office, met together to choose one of themselves, to practice amongst themselves for the better management of their joint counsels, than to call other persons to their own office, in which they had no part before. But if he was bishop, in the peculiar sense of the word (as I doubt not St. Jerome meant, and this argument supposeth), then here is demonstration of the distinction between bishops and presbyters from the very days of the Apostles.

"2d. This very choosing themselves a bishop is so far from proving that they were not under restraint in the point of ordination, that it is the very putting themselves under that restraint; as a people choosing any person, from amongst themselves, to be their king, restrains that right, which was originally in them, of granting commissions of lesser importance; and is designed to devolve the power of doing this upon this single person; so far is it from proving that they themselves continue to exercise it. And, according to St. Jerome, the presbyters choosing and setting a bishop over themselves, is the thing which put a period to their ruling the churches in common, and with a proper equality; and from the very time of their doing this, they must, according to him, be under restraint. So that instead of argu-

ing, the presbyters chose their bishop, a superior officer, therefore much more ordained presbyters; I argue, the presbyters of Alexandria chose to themselves bishops from the very time of the Apostles; therefore from that time they were restrained from ordaining other presbyters, supposing they had an original right to that work.

"For what, I pray, is that restraint which Blondel and this author contend that the presbyters voluntarily put themselves under, near the middle of the second century; but what resulted from their choosing, from amongst themselves, governors whom they called bishops? And what is that restraint which St. Jerome speaks of, but the very order that one should be chosen from among the presbyters, to whom the care of the Church should be in a peculiar sense committed? Nay, supposing this person chosen by them to have been only a prime-presbyter, what I am saying is so evident, that Blondel himself acknowledges such a restraint upon the presbyters by their choice of a prime-presbyter, as that nothing was afterwards to be done, in which he was not to bear a principal part. And St. Jerome's only design being to point out the occasion of that distinction of bishops and presbyters, which prevailed in his days, and on which the restraint put upon presbyters, according to him, was settled in the Church; to be sure he could mean nothing in these words, less than to prove that this restraint

was in the Church of Alexandria from the time of St. Mark, by showing that from that time the presbyters of that Church had chosen bishops and placed them over themselves.

"For the sentence going before is to this purpose, that though in his opinion the original design was that presbyters should govern by their presbyteries; yet that afterwards one was chosen from amongst them to be set over the rest; and that this was designed for the preventing some abuses and schisms. To prove this, he appeals to the Church of Alexandria, in which he saith the presbyters, even from the time of St. Mark, had chosen one from amongst themselves whom they called peculiarly by the name of bishop, to be sure for the purpose above mentioned, *in remedium schismatis.* If, therefore, the distinction in his days between the offices of bishops and priests was *in remedium schismatis*, it follows that this election of a bishop (which he here speaks of) was for the same end. For no one can say but that St. Jerome is here speaking of that choice of a bishop which restrained the power of presbyters, whatever he supposed them to be.

"3d. It doth not in the least follow from the presbyters choosing their own bishops, that they pretended to ordain presbyters; and yet the whole of this argument is founded upon their choosing their own bishops. Suppose it be said of any company of men, that they met together and

chose one from amongst themselves, and having placed him by that means in a higher station, they called him king; doth it follow because they thus made him king, therefore to be sure they did what is of lesser importance; that therefore any of them, or all of them, after this, gave commissions to other officers under this king? No; from the time of that election he is, by the will of God and the law of nature, invested with all due authority; and it is his business to give commissions to all inferior officers. Just so it is in the case before us. Let it be granted that those presbyters chose one out of their number, and that having by that means placed him in a higher station, they called him bishop, which is all St. Jerome saith, it will not follow from hence that after this election, they assumed to themselves to give commissions to inferior ecclesiastical officers; but rather that from this time, this was one of his peculiar businesses, as I have just now been observing.

"4th. As there is no consequence in the argument drawn from hence, so neither doth St. Jerome give the least color to such an argument, but in the same place useth such expressions as absolutely overthrow it. He doth not say that these presbyters conferred power and authority upon their bishop; nor doth it follow from what he saith, any more than it follows from a prince's nominating a person to a bishopric, that such nomination is the sole authority by which he acts

in ecclesiastical matters. He may, notwithstanding this, derive his authority from the will of God; and the instant of the election be the time from whence the will of God concerning his authority must be supposed to take place. And therefore this author doth not well to add such expressions as these to those of St. Jerome, to embellish his argument, which at least must rest wholly upon that father.

"Again, he useth the word *episcopus* in a peculiar sense, as signifying an office distinct from presbyters. The same word he useth in the very next sentence in the same sense, and denies to presbyters the right of ordination, as I have shown before, which he here appropriates to bishops. But what is very remarkable, he illustrates the presbyters choosing their bishop by the similitude of an army choosing their general. Now, from hence it follows, that as the army after such election, pretended not to the granting inferior commissions in it, but did indeed, by means of this election, devolve this upon the person chosen general; so neither did the presbyters, after the election of their bishop, pretend to the granting commissions to inferior presbyters; and this for a very good reason, namely, because they had, by this election, devolved this business upon the person chosen bishop, as they had the care of the churches in all cases in a very peculiar manner. But, as I pass, I cannot forbear asking, if this account, the

Alexandrian presbyters choosing their own bishops, be true, what becomes of that inalienable right of the laity in elections, of which this author upon another occasion speaks?

"Thus have we seen of how little force this argument, from these presbyters choosing their own bishop, is, to prove that they did all that time exercise their supposed right of ordination; and how little satisfaction this gives us in our inquiry, how and when the exercise of this right came to be restrained in the Church. From whence I likewise draw an argument that it was the same (in St. Jerome's opinion) in all churches, as in the Church of Alexandria, because he makes the government of churches to be always the same in all places; and the decree on which he founds the restraint put upon presbyters to be universal and at the same time.

"Consequently, therefore, if it was in pursuance of this desire that the Alexandrian Church chose bishops, and that by this choice the presbyters were restrained in the exercise of their original right, this restraint must likewise be as early, according to St. Jerome, in all other churches, that is, from the very days of the Apostles. Consequently, likewise, if the learned Blondel be the defender and follower of St. Jerome, he cannot pretend to fix the time of this restraint in any of the churches later than this. Much less can he, consistently with himself, first fix the time of this

restraint (which St. Jerome represents as at the same time universal) to the middle of the second century, and afterwards argue from St. Jerome himself, that it could not be in the Church of Alexandria till the end of the third century.

"However, this may be palliated; having examined the so much boasted instance of the Alexandrian presbyters, and found it so mistaken and so misapplied, I shall not trouble myself to search that dark author for any other less material instances, but content myself with having considered what is principally urged and depended on by those who have given the latest occasion of the present debate."

Thus, with consummate ability, does Bishop Hoadley argue the question of moderate episcopacy; and if the argument could have always been presented with equal wisdom and prudence, many objections would not have been offered to its acceptance.

For Bishop Hoadley opposes with equal power the doctrine of an essential, unbroken, episcopal succession, which has so largely brought odium upon the Episcopal cause, and occasioned its rejection by so many learned and candid persons.

On page 489 of this same volume, this author remarks: "I think not an uninterrupted line of succession of regularly ordained bishops necessary."

In his "Preservative" (p. 75), he more largely

argues the point, and thus forcibly expresses his convictions: "I do not love, I confess, so much as to repeat the principal branches of their beloved scheme; they are so different, whencesoever they come, from the voice of the gospel. When they would claim you, as their fellow-laborers the Papists do, by telling you that you cannot hope for the favor of God but in the strictest communion in their Church (which is the true Church of England, governed by bishops in a regular succession); that God hath himself hung your salvation upon this nicety; that He dispenses none of His favors or graces but by the hands of them and their subordinate priests; that you cannot be authoritatively blessed or released from your sins but by them who are the regular priests; that churches under other bishops (*i. e.*, other than in regular succession) are schismatical conventicles, made up of excommunicated persons, both clergy and laity, out of God's Church, and out of His favor: I say, when such arguments as these are urged, you need only to have recourse to a general answer to this whole heap of scandal and defamation upon the will of God, the gospel of Christ, and the Church of England in particular; that you have not so learned Christ, or the design of his gospel, or even the foundation of this particular part of his Church, reformed and established in England.

"The following arguments will justify you

which, therefore, ought to be frequently in the thoughts of all who have any regard for the most important point: God is just and equal and good, and as sure as He is, He cannot put the salvation and happiness of any man upon what He himself has put it out of the power of any man upon earth to be entirely satisfied in; it hath not pleased God, in His providence, to keep up any proof of the least probability, or moral possibility of a regular uninterrupted succession."

This language, addressed by this eminent defender of Episcopacy, to the Non-jurors of his day, is equally applicable to the Tractarians and Ritualists of our own times, their true successors, and deserves the solemn consideration of every member of our communion who seeks the glory of God in the advancement of the truth, and of a pure gospel.

CHAPTER XII.

SUCCESSION OF SOUND DOCTRINE, THE TRUE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

N.B.

As a fitting close to this examination of the Institutions of the Church of Alexandria, in their bearing on the doctrine of episcopal succession, we give the views of nearly all the prominent writers under Edward and Elizabeth, with those of other later standard writers, on this important topic.

That the Reformers regarded the succession of Scriptural truth as the succession by which the Church of God was to be distinguished, is clear from their writings. They make no distinct mention of the subject in the Articles, or Ordinal. Inasmuch as many modern writers have asserted that valid succession is ministerial and tactual, and must be episcopal and uninterrupted, in order to find the doctrine of our Church on this subject, and to expose a pernicious error, we must turn to the writings of the Compilers under Edward, and the Revisers under Elizabeth.

JOHN BRADFORD (d. 1555).

A clear statement of the matter is made by John Bradford, Bishop Ridley's chaplain, "whom in my conscience," said Ridley, "I judge more worthy to be a bishop, than many of us that be bishops already, to be a parish priest." He was the man whom, of all others, the Papists labored to reclaim.

Dr. Harpsfield, the papal examiner, held the following conversation with Bradford: —

"The Church hath also," saith he, "succession of bishops." And here he made much ado to prove that this was an essential point.

"You say as you would have it," quoth I; "for if this point fail you, all the Church you go about to set forth will fall down. You shall not find in all the Scripture this your essential point of succession of bishops," quoth I. "In Christ's Church Antichrist will sit."

"Tell me," quoth he, "were not the Apostles bishops?"

"No," quoth I, "except you make a new definition of bishops; that is, give them no certain place."

"Indeed," said he, "the Apostles' office was more than bishops, for it was universal; but yet Christ instituted bishops in His Church, as Paul saith, 'He hath given pastors, prophets;' so that I trow it proved by the Scriptures the succession of bishops to be an essential point."

To this I answered that "the ministry of God's word and ministers is an essential point; but to translate this to bishops and their succession," quoth I, "is a plain subtility; and therefore," quoth I, "that it may be plain, I will ask you a question. Tell me whether the Scriptures know any difference between bishops and ministers whom you call priests?"

"No," saith he.

"Well, then, go on forward," quoth I, "and let us see what you get now by the succession of bishops, that is of ministers; which cannot be understood of such bishops as minister not, but lord it."

"The next day," writes Bradford, "Master Harpsfield began a very long oration almost three quarters of an hour long, first repeating what he had said, and how far we had gone over night, and therewith did begin to prove upward succession of bishops here in England, for eight hundred years; in France, at Lyons, for twelve hundred years; in Spain, at Hispallen, for eight hundred years; in Italy, at Milan, for twelve hundred years, laboring by this to prove his Church; whereto he used succession of bishops in the last Church for the more confirmation of his words, and so concluded with an exhortation and an interrogation: the exhortation that I could obey his Church; the interrogation, whether I could show any such succession for the demon-

stration of my Church (for so he called it) which I followed."

Now what was the reply to this argument, a *fac-simile* of all exclusive succession arguments since? —

"Unto this, his long oration, I made a short answer, how that my memory was evil for to answer particularly his long oration; therefore I would generally do it, thinking that because his oration was rather to persuade than to prove, that a general answer would serve. So I told him, that if Christ or His Apostles, being here on earth, had been demanded of the prelates of the Church, then to have made a demonstration of the Church by succession of high priests, which had approved the doctrine He had taught: 'I think,' quoth I, 'that Christ here would have done as I do; that is: would have brought forth that which upholdeth the Church, even the verity of the word of God taught and believed, not of the high priests (which of long time had persecuted it), but of the prophets and other good, simple men, which perchance were counted for heretics by the Church, that is, with them that were ordained high priests in the Church; to whom the true Church was not then tied by any succession, but the word of God.'" (Vol. i. pp. 501, 505.)

BISHOP RIDLEY (d. 1555).

This view of Bradford, of great importance in this connection, is maintained by Bishop Ridley, confessedly, of all the Edwardian Reformers, of most influence generally in our communion. In his farewell letter to his Christian friends, written a few days before his martyrdom, Ridley says of the Church of Rome: "It may justly be called *Apostolici*, that is, true disciples of the Apostles, and also that church and congregation of Christians an apostolic church, yea, and that, certain hundred years after the same was first erected and builded upon Christ, by the true apostolical doctrine taught by the mouths of the Apostles themselves. . . . So long and so many hundred years as that see did truly teach and preach that gospel, that religion, exercise that power, and ordered everything by these laws and rules, which that see received of the Apostles, and, as Tertullian saith, the Apostles of Christ, and Christ of God; so long (I say) that see might well have been called Peter and Paul's chair and see, or rather Christ's chair, and the bishop thereof Apostolicus, or a true disciple and successor of the Apostles, and a minister of Christ. . . .

"For understand, my lords, it was neither for the privilege of the place or person thereof, that that see and bishop thereof were called Apostolic, *but for the true trade of Christ's religion*, which was taught and maintained in that see at the

first, and of those godly men. And therefore as truly and justly as that see then, for that true trade of religion and consanguinity of doctrine with the religion and doctrine of Christ's Apostles, was called apostolic; so, as truly and justly, for the contrariety of religion and diversity of doctrine from Christ and his Apostles, that see and the bishop thereof at this day both ought to be called, and are indeed, antichristian. That see is the seat of Satan; and the bishop of the same, that maintaineth the abominations thereof, is Antichrist himself indeed." Writing to Bradford in reference ("Works," 414, 418) to the discussion on the Church given above, Ridley exclaims: "O good Lord, that they are so busy with you about the Church! It is no new thing, brother, that is happened unto you! for that was always the clamor of the wicked bishops and priests, against God's true prophets. 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord!' and they said, 'The law shall not depart from the priest, nor wisdom from the elder;' and yet in them whom only they esteemed for priests and sages, there was neither God's law nor godly wisdom."

The stress that Ridley lays on the necessity of sound doctrine to preserve church character is very observable.

BISHOP LATIMER (d. 1555).

Bishop Latimer, in his conference with Ridley, expresses himself in a similar manner.

"The Scripture is not of any private interpretation at any time. For such a one, though he be a layman, fearing God, is much more fit to understand holy Scripture than any arrogant and proud priest, yea, than the bishop himself, be he never so glistening and great in all his pontificals. . . . Let the Papists go with their long faith; be thou contented with the short faith of the saint, which is revealed unto view the word of God written. Adieu to all popish fantasies, Amen. For one man having the Scripture and good reason for him, is more to be esteemed himself alone, than a thousand such as they either gathered together, or *succeeding one another*" (p. 114).

BISHOP HOOPER (d 1555).

Bishop Hooper — Edward's favorite preacher, and who if Edward had lived would have exercised a most commanding influence upon the conduct of the Reformation — is most forcible in the expression of two views on this point.

Hooper had differed with Ridley with respect to the continuance in use of the Roman vestment. These differences were settled. Ridley writes, "To my most dear brother, and reverend *fellow-elder* in Christ, John Hooper, grace and

peace. . . . Forasmuch as I understand by your works, which I have yet but superficially seen, that we *thoroughly agree* and *wholly consent together* in those things which are the grounds and substantial points of our religion, against the which the world so furiously rageth in these our days, howsoever in time past in swollen waters and circumstances of religion, your wisdom and my simplicity (I confess) have in some points varied," etc.

In his "Declaration of Christ and his Office," 1547, Hooper writes: "Such as teach the people to know the Church by these signs: namely, the traditions of men and the succession of bishops, teach wrong." In the "Confession of his Faith," written 1550, he says: "As concerning the ministers of the Church, I believe that the Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession of bishops, cardinals, or such like, but unto the very word of God; and none of them should be believed but when they speak the word of God." In 1552, he charges his clergy to instruct their people: "lest that any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto any ordinary succession of bishops and priests, but only unto the word of God and the right use of his sacraments." ("Works," i. 82; ii. 90, 120.)

ARCHDEACON PHILPOT (d. 1555).

Archdeacon Philpot, an accomplished Canonist under Edward, and a martyr, when the Archbishop of York urged: "Rome hath known succession of bishops, which your Church hath not; *ergo*, that is the Catholic Church, and yours is not, because there is no such succession can be proved in your Church," replied: "I deny, my lord, that succession of bishops is an infallible point to know the Church by; for there may be a succession of bishops known in a place, and yet there be no church, as at Antioch, and Jerusalem, and in other places, where the Apostles abode as well as at Rome. But if you put to the succession of bishops, succession of doctrine withal (as St. Augustine doth), I will grant it to be a good proof for the Catholic Church; but a local succession is nothing available. . . . Although you can prove the succession of bishops from Peter, yet this is not sufficient to prove Rome the Catholic Church, unless you can prove the profession of Peter's faith, whereupon the Catholic Church is builded, to have continued in his successors at Rome, and at this present time." ("Examinations," pp. 37, 137.)

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER (d. 1556).

It is not necessary to quote Archbishop Cranmer in this connection, inasmuch as his views on this subject are acknowledged to be as compre-

hensive as any of his contemporaries, and have been previously referred to in this volume. We see from the language of these most prominent and influential of the divines under Edward, that the exclusive uninterrupted episcopal succession theory, was by all rejected.

The translator of Cranmer's "Confutation of Unwritten Verities," a contemporary, writes (p. 11, Parker Society ed.): "Such gross ignorance (I would to God it were but ignorance indeed) is entered into their heads, and such arrogant boldness possesseth their hearts, that they are bold to affirm no church to be a true church of God, but that which standeth by ordinary succession of bishops, in such pompous and glorious sort as now is seen. . . . As sweet agreeth with sour, black with white, darkness with light, and evil with good; even so this outward, seen, and visible Church, consisting of the ordinary succession of bishops, agreeth with Christ." The name of this author is not ascertained.

We pass now to the reign of Elizabeth, the period of the revision of the Prayer Book.

BISHOP JEWEL (d. 1571).

And first we have Bishop Jewel, the most learned of the bishops, declaring in his "Apology," a public work: "God's grace is promised to a good mind, and to any one that feareth Him, not to sees and successions." In the "Defense of

his Apology" (p. 201), he writes: "To be Peter's lawful successor, it is not sufficient to leap into Peter's stall. Lawful succession standeth not only in succession of place, but also and much rather, in doctrine and diligence."

Harding, the Romanist, asks Jewel: "If you cannot show your bishoply pedigree, if you can prove no succession, then whereby hold you? Tell us the original and first spring of your Church! Show us the register of your bishops, continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so as that fails bishops have some one of the Apostles or apostolic men for his author and predecessor. How can you prove your vocation? By what authority usurp you the administration of doctrine and sacraments? What can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? Who hath called you? Who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it? How and by whom were you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Who hath committed to you the office you take upon you? Be you a priest or be you not? If you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office of a bishop? If you be, who gave you orders? The institution of a priest was never yet in the power of a bishop?"

To this argument, similar to that of Harpsfield, what does this writer of the second "Book of Homilies," and publisher of our Articles, reply, in

words which were placed in the parish churches of England?

"If it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth ever more orderly by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession, whereof he hath told us so long a tale, a very good substantial argument of the truth. But Christ saith, by order of succession, 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair.' Annas and Caiaphas, touching succession, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eliezar. Of succession, St. Paul saith unto the faithful at Ephesus: 'I know that after my departure hence, ravening wolves shall succeed me. And out of yourselves there shall (by succession) spring up men speaking perversely.' Therefore St. Hierome saith: 'They be not always the children of holy men that (by succession) have the places of holy men.' As the Scribes and Pharisees succeeded Moses, perverting and breaking the laws of Moses; even so do the bishops of Rome this day succeed Christ, perverting and breaking the laws of Christ. . . . Such affiance some time had the Scribes and Pharisees in their succession. Therefore they said: 'We are the children of Abraham;' unto us hath God made his promises: 'Art thou greater than our father Abraham?' As for Christ 'we know not from whence he came,' or what can he show for his succession. And when Christ began to reform their abuses

and errors, they said unto him, 'By what power doest thou these things. And who gave thee this authority?' Where is thy succession? Thus to maintain themselves in credit, for that they had continuance and succession from Aaron and sat in Moses' chair, they kept Christ quite out of possession, and said unto Him, even as Mr. Harding saith now unto us: 'Who ever taught us these things before thee? What ordinary succession and vocation had thou? What bishop admitted thee? Who confirmed thee? Who allowed thee?' . . . All other things failing, they must hold only by succession; and only because they sit in Moses' chair they must claim the possession of the whole.

"This is the right and virtue of their succession. . . . We neither have bishops without church, nor church without bishops. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them whom you often call apostates, as if our Church were no church without them. . . . They are for a great part learned and grave and godly men, and are ashamed to see your follies. Notwithstanding, if there were not one, neither of them nor of us, left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Louvaine. . . Whosoever is a member of Christ's body, whosoever is a child of the Church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name, is fully invested with their priesthood, and therefore may justly be

called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, 'yea, though they be only laymen, yet have they a church!' . . . God's name be blessed forever! We want neither church nor priesthood, nor any kind of sacrifice that Christ hath left unto his faithful."

"Faith cometh (not by succession, but) by hearing; and hearing cometh (not of legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop, but) of the word of God. 'Succession,' you say, 'is the chief way for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist.' I grant you if you mean the succession of doctrine. It is not sufficient to claim succession of place, it behoveth us rather to have regard to succession of doctrine." ("Works," iii. 320, 38, 48.)

BISHOP PILKINGTON (died 1575).

Bishop Pilkington, one of the Revisers, remarks ("Works," p. 600), "Succession in doctrine makes them the sons of the prophets and apostles, and not sitting in the same seat nor being bishops of the same place . . . There cannot be proved a succession of their bishops in any one place of this realm since the Apostles. . . . So stands the succession of the Church not in mitres, palaces, lands, or lordships, but in teaching some religion and sorting out the contrary. . . . He that does these things is the true successor of the Apostles. . . . When they can bring the Apostles' doctrine or life, for example, to be like their life and teaching, they may say they follow the Apostles."

DR. WHITTAKER (died 1595).

The learned Professor Whittaker, in reply to Bellarmin's "Disputation of Scripture" (p. 570), writes: "Though we should concede the succession of that Church unbroken and entire, yet that succession would be a matter of no weight, because we regard not the external succession of place and persons, but the internal one of faith and doctrine." And elsewhere he says: "Faith is, as it were, the soul of the succession, which faith, being wanting, the naked succession of persons is like a dead carcass without the soul. The Fathers indeed always much more regarded the succession of faith than any unbroken series of men."

DR. WILLET (died 1621).

Dr. Willet, in his "Synopsis Papismi" (p. 276), writes: "Every godly and faithful bishop is a successor of the Apostles. We deny it not, and so are all godly and faithful pastors and ministers. The province of succession, we see, is in the preaching of the Word, which appertaineth as well to other pastors and ministers as to bishops."

DR. FULKE (died 1589).

Dr. Fulke, a noted antagonist of Popery, in his answer to Stapleton (p. 74), says: "The Scripture requireth no succession of names, persons, or places, but of faith and doctrine; and that we

prove when we affirm our faith and doctrine by the doctrine of the Apostles. Neither had the Fathers any other meaning, in calling upon new upstart heresies for their succession, but by a succession of doctrine, as well as of persons." . . . And against Sanders (p. 26): "The same authority of preaching and ministering the sacraments, of binding and loosing, which the Apostles had, is perpetual in the Church, in the bishop and elders, which are all successors of the Apostles."

BISHOP BILSON (died 1616).

Bishop Bilson, appealed to by Keble in support of his views, makes this forcible statement, as quoted by Brown, in his "Letters to Pusey' (p. 288): "The succession is of no weight, unless truth of doctrine and purity of life be added to it."

DR. SUTCLIFFE (died 1629).

Dr. Sutcliffe, also appealed to by Keble, thus writes: "Stapleton asserts that we (the Protestant churches) are destitute of the succession. And he thinks we are terribly pressed by this argument; but without reason. For the external succession, which both heretics often have and the orthodox have not, is of no moment. Not even our adversaries themselves, indeed, are certain respecting their own succession. But we are certain, that our doctors have succeeded to the Apostles and prophets and most ancient

Fathers. And moreover, if there is any weight in external succession, they have succeeded to the bishops and presbyters throughout Germany, France, England, and other countries, and were ordained by them." ("De vera Eccles." p. 37, 38.)

CALFHILL (died 1570).

In his "Treatise on the Cross," p. 230, this divine, bishop elect of Worcester, writes: "1. And whosoever will be successors unto the Apostles, must use this ministry, this trade of doctrine, which, if they continue in being lawfully called thereunto by God, and have gifts competent to approve their calling unto the world, they care not for the sign of the cross to be imprinted in them, the virtue whereof never departed from them. Certain it is that neither Scripture nor any learned father commendeth the blessing of prayer to us. And how your wisdom doth esteem the wagging of a bishop's fingers I greatly force not. I looked rather that ye should have commended the oil for anointing, which the greasy merchants will have in every mess.

"2. For the *character indelebilis*, 'the mark unremovable,' is thereby given. Yet there is a way to have it out well enough, to rub them well favorably with salt and ashes, or, if that will not serve, with a little soap."

ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT (died 1610).

"It is most apparent, and cannot be denied, but that Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and divers other ancient writers, do call the bishops the Apostles' successors; insomuch as some of them, especially the authors of the ecclesiastical histories, do draw long catalogues of the particular bishops' names that succeeded the Apostles, and other apostolical men whom they made bishops, which catalogues and manner of speech of the said Fathers, being used by them very fitly against such heretics as did arise up in their days, have since, in our time, been greatly abused by the Papists. Unto whom the learned men, that have stood for the truth against them, by writing have *continually answered*, that the Fathers' arguments, drawn from the said personal succession of bishops, were very effectual so long as the succession of the Apostles' *doctrine* did concur; wherewithal that the Fathers, in urging of the first, had ever an *especial* eye to the second, some point of doctrine being ever called in question by the said heretics." ("Survey," chap. xxvii. p. 333.)

ARCHDEACON MASON (died 1621).

"That assertion of Stapleton's, to wit, that 'wheresoever this succession is, there is also a true Catholic Church,' cannot be defended; but Bellarmin saith, far more truly: 'It is not necessarily gathered that the Church is always

where there is succession.' For, besides this outward succession, there must be likewise the inward succession of doctrine to make a true church. Irenæus describeth those which have a true succession from the Apostles, 'to be such as with the succession of the episcopal office have received the certain grace of truth.' And this kind of succession he calleth 'the principal succession.' So Gregory Nazianzen, having said 'that Athanasius succeeded St. Mark in godliness,' addeth, that 'this succession in godliness is properly to be accounted succession; for he that holdeth the same doctrine is also partaker of the same throne; but he that is against the doctrine must be reported an adversary, even while he sitteth on the throne, for the latter hath the name of succession, but the former hath the thing itself, and the truth.' Therefore you must prove your succession in doctrine, otherwise you must be holden for adversaries, even while you sit on the throne." ("On the Consecration of the Bishops, &c., in the Church of England," book ii. chap. i. p. 41–43.) Archdeacon Mason elsewhere remarks: "Seeing a priest is equal to a bishop in the power of order, he hath equally intrinsical power to give orders." (Tract, p. 160.)

It is evident, from these prominent writers of the reign of Elizabeth, that the same view was taken of succession, as was held by the Compilers under Edward.

BISHOP BABINGTON (died 1610).

If we pass to the next generation of divines trained under the Revisers, we find Bishop Babington, of the Commission of 1604, declaring: "They are true successors of the Apostles that succeed in virtue, holiness, truth, etc. . . . Not that sit on the same stool. Faith cometh by hearing, saith St. Paul (not by succession), and hearing cometh (not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop), but by the Word of God."

DEAN FIELD (died 1616).

Dean Field on the same Commission, writes (Bk. ii. ch. 30): "Thus still we see that truth of doctrine is a necessary note whereby the Church must be known and discovered, and not ministry, or succession, or anything else without it."

Bk. iii. ch. 39, he writes: "It is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter is not a distinct power and order, but an eminence and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank for order's sake, and to preserve the peace and unity of the Church. If bishops become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the Church is devolved to the presbyters remaining Catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the ministry pertains to them likewise."

BISHOP DAVENANT (died 1641).

Bishop Davenant, a deputy to the Synod of Dort, observes: "All boast about local succession is empty, unless a succession of true doctrine be also proved." (Alport's "Life of Davenant," i. 20.)

BISHOP FRANCIS WHITE (died 1624).

Bishop Francis White, of Ely (p. 64): "The true visible Church is named apostolical, not because of local and personal succession of bishops, (only or principally), but because it retaineth the faith and doctrine of the Apostles. Personal or local succession only, and in itself, maketh not the Church apostolical."

DR. THOMAS WHITE (died 1604).

Dr. White, Prebendary of St. Paul's, in reply to a Jesuit's objection, "The Protestant Church is not apostolic because they cannot derive their pedigree lineally without interruption from the Apostles, as the Roman Church can from St. Peter, but are forced to acknowledge some other, as Calvin, Luther, or some such," replies: "Our answer is, that the succession required to make a church apostolic, must be defined by the doctrine, and not by the place or person. Wheresoever the true faith contained in the Scriptures is properly embraced, there is the whole and full nature of the Apostolic Church. For the external succession we care not."

ARCHBISHOP LAUD (died 1645).

Archbishop Laud, to whom we are indebted for the introduction of exclusive churchmanship into the English Church, makes a remarkable concession with respect to the point we are considering.

He writes, in reply to Fisher, the Jesuit: "Besides for succession in general, I shall say this: It is a great happiness where it may be had visible and continued, and a great conquest over the mutability of this present world. But I do not find any one of the ancient Fathers that makes local, personal, visible, and continued succession a necessary sign or mark of the Church in any one place. . . . Most evident it is, that the succession which the Fathers meant is not tied to place or person, but it is tied to purity of doctrine." Elsewhere he says: "I have endeavored to unite the Calvinists and Lutherans; nor have I absolutely unchurched them. I say indeed in my book against Fisher, according to St. Jerome, No bishop, no church; and that none but a bishop can ordain, except in cases of inevitable necessity; and whether that be the case in the foreign churches the world may judge."

With regard to the necessity of an uninterrupted, tactual, episcopal succession, to constitute a valid ministry, we present the opinions of a few modern Episcopal writers of acknowledged eminence.

DEAN PEARSON.

Dean Pearson, of Salisbury, in his Charge, 1842, objects to "this assertion of the absolute necessity of the apostolic succession of episcopacy to the existence of a Christian Church, or to the validity and efficacy of the Christian Sacrament; a position which, however countenanced by the opinions, whether of ancient or modern writers, and consistent as it is with the spirit of Romanism, I venture to affirm, without fear of successful contradiction, has never been assumed by the Church of England; which, while asserting in the preface to her offices of Consecration and Ordination, the apostolic origin of the third order of ministers in Christ's Church, and while lamenting by her accredited writers, as an imperfection and defect, the want of the episcopal order in some of the Reformed churches on the Continent, does not excommunicate, or on that account refuse to acknowledge them, while adhering to the orthodox faith, as to all that is essential, as true and living branches of Christ's Universal Church."

DEAN ALFORD.

This modern standard commentator, on the proof text of Scripture, upon which the scheme of Apostolic Succession is based, Matt. xxviii. 16–20, writes: —

"We are therefore obliged to conclude that *others were* present (beside the eleven). Whether these

others were the 'five hundred brethren at once,' of whom Paul speaks, does not appear. '*Go ye therefore and teach*,' etc. Demonstrably, this was not understood as spoken to the Apostles *only;* but to all the brethren. To understand '*with you*' only of the Apostles and their successors is to destroy the whole force of these most weighty words. Descending even into literal exactness, we may see that '*teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*,' makes '*them*' into '*you*' as soon as they are '*made disciples*.' The command is to the universal Church — to be performed, in the nature of things, by her ministers and teachers, the manner of appointing which is not here prescribed, but to be learned in the unfoldings of Providence, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, who by his special ordinance were the founders and first builders of that Church; but whose office, *on that very account, precluded the idea of succession or renewal*."

BISHOP O'BRIEN.

Bishop O'Brien, of Ossory, writes, in his Charge, 1842: "All our great divines, who maintain the reality and advantages of a succession 'from the Apostles' time,' of episcopally consecrated bishops, and episcopally ordained ministers to the Church, and who rejoice in the possession of it by our own Church, as a signal blessing and privilege, not only do not maintain that this is abso-

lutely essential to the being of a church, but are at pains to make it clear that they do not hold that it is."

BISHOP HOPKINS.

Our late presiding Bishop Hopkins, in his "Reply to Milner," vol. ii. p. 3, makes a similar statement: "Dr. Milner asserts that the Church of England unchurches all other Protestant communions which are without the apostolical succession of bishops. Whereas, on the contrary, not only does Hooker, whom he quotes on the previous page, but all the Reformers, together with Jewel, Andrewes, Usher, Bramhall, and in a word, the whole of our standard divines, agree in maintaining that Episcopacy is not necessary to the *being*, but only to the *well-being* of the Church; and hence they grant the names of churches to all denominations of Christians who hold the *fundamental doctrines of the gospel*, notwithstanding the imperfection and irregularity of their ministry. . . . This allegation of Dr. Milner, therefore, is founded on anything but truth. And it is not easy to believe that he was ignorant of his error, because the contrary is apparent in the Thirty-nine Articles of our Church, and in the whole strain of her acts and history."

DR. WHARTON.

Dr. Wharton, the most distinguished scholar of the Committee on the Revision of the American

Prayer Book, thus expresses his views: "The pretense of tracing up the Roman Church to the times of the Apostles, is grounded on mere sophistry. The succession which Roman Catholics thus unfairly ascribe to their Church, belongs to every other and exclusively to none. But that portion of the Christian Church is surely best entitled to this claim, which teaches in the greatest purity the doctrine of the Apostles. . . . 'They have not the inheritance of Peter, who have not Peter's faith,' says St. Ambrose" (vol. ii. p. 313).

DR. SMITH.

Dr. Smith, of the same Committee, says: "There is greater weight and moment of Christianity in charity, than in all the doubtful questions about which the Protestant Churches have been puzzling themselves and biting and devouring each other since the days of the Reformation. . . . It will not be so much a question at the last day, of what church we were, nor whether we were of Paul or Apollos, but whether we were of Christ Jesus, and had the true mark of Christianity in our lives."

ARCHBISHOP MUSGRAVE.

We close with the words of the late lamented Primates of England. Archbishop Musgrave, of York, thus charges his clergy, 1842: "You will exceed all just bounds, if you are continually insisting upon the necessity of a belief in, and the

certainty of, the apostolical succession in the bishops and presbyters of our Church, as the only security for the efficacy of the sacraments, so that those who do not receive them from men so accredited, and appointed to minister, cannot partake of the promises and consolations of the gospel; and are, therefore, in peril of their salvation, and left to the uncovenanted mercies of God, which may be, in the end, no mercies at all to them. . . . This would be to overstep the limits of prudence and humility, and arrogantly to set up a claim, which neither Scripture, nor the formularies and various offices of the Church, nor the writings of her best divines, nor the common sense of mankind will allow.

"To spread abroad this notion, would be to make ourselves the derision of the world; it would be contrary to the mind of St. Paul. . . . With respect to this, and to some other of the questions now brought into prominence, our Reformers appear to have been of the same mind as a pious prelate of former times, who distinguished between what is essential to the being, and what is essential to the well-being of the Church: — a wise distinction, which good sense and Christian charity should lead us all ever to keep in sight."

ARCHBISHOP SUMNER.

This Christian view of this subject is nowhere more forcibly expressed than by the apostolic

Archbishop Sumner, of Canterbury, whose words form a fitting close to this inquiry: "The surest sign of an Apostle is that in which St. Paul took comfort, 'the work of faith, and labor of love, and patience of hope,' which his disciples exercised, which resulted from his ministry, and proved that God was with him. To 'turn many to righteousness,' that is real preëminence. To 'win souls to Christ,' that is lasting honor. To 'take heed to ourselves and to the doctrine,' that is both to save ourselves and them that hear us. To 'preach the Word, to be instant in season and out of season; to testify, both publicly and from house to house, repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ,'—*this is to be a successor to the Apostles.*"

APPENDIX A.

ADDITIONAL TESTIMONY.

The writer has recently met with an interesting work by an anonymous author, entitled "The Rights of the Christian Church, asserted against the Romish, and all other Priests who claim an independent Power over it." The third edition was printed in London, 1707. The writer commences his preface thus: "Nothing is more disputed at present, than who is the best Churchman, both High and Low Church laying claim to it."

This book, written by a Churchman of extensive learning, contains much that bears upon matters discussed in the preceding pages. Among other statements we find, on p. 50 of the preface, that Archbishop Laud forbade the works of Jewel, Willet, and Foxe to be reprinted. He quotes from a remarkable speech of Lord Falkland, a distinguished Churchman and Royalist, delivered in Parliament, Feb. 9, 1640, these words, which apply well to our own times: "Mr. Speaker,—He

is a great stranger in Israel, who knows not that this kingdom hath long labored under many and great oppressions, both in religion and liberty; and his acquaintance here is not great, or his ingenuity less, who does not know and acknowledge, that a great, if not a principal cause of both these hath been some bishops and their adherents.

"Mr. Speaker, a little search will serve to find them to have been the destruction of unity under pretense of uniformity; to have brought in superstition and scandal under the titles of reverence and decency; to have defiled our Church, by adorning our churches; to have slackened the strictness of that union which was formerly betwixt us and those of our religion beyond the sea; an action as impolitic as ungodly.

"As Sir Thomas More says of the Casuists, their business was not to keep men from sinning, but to inform them, *quam prope ad peccatum sive peccato liceat accedere;* so it seemed their work (meaning the prelates) was to try how much of a Papist might be brought in without Popery, and to destroy as much as they could of the gospel, without bringing themselves into danger of being destroyed by law.

"Mr. Speaker, to go yet farther: some of them have so industriously labored to deduce themselves from *Rome*, that they have given great suspicion, that in gratitude they desire to return thither, or at least meet it half way. Some have

evidently labored to bring in an English though not a Roman Popery; I mean not the outside only and dress of it, but equally absolute, a blind obedience of the people upon the clergy, and of the clergy upon themselves; and have opposed Papacy beyond the sea, that they might settle one this side the water. Nay, common fame is more than ordinarily false, if none of them have found a way to reconcile the opinions of Rome to the preferments of England, and to be so absolutely, directly, and cordially Papist, that it is all £1500 *per Ann.* can do to keep them from confessing it."

"The Church of England," writes this author, "was so far from thinking a succession of bishops necessary to her being, that she did not believe Episcopacy to be of divine appointment; for the book entitled, 'The Institution of Christian Man,' subscribed by the clergy in convocation, and confirmed by Parliament, owns bishops and presbyters by Scripture to be the same; and yet the Vatican thought themselves at liberty to have an order superior to that of presbyters, — a sufficient acknowledgment that they thought no form of government fixed by Christ. And what the sense of our Church was in 1610, is plain from Archbishop Bancroft and the rest of the bishops owning the ordination of presbyters to be valid, and therefore refusing to reordain the Scottish presbyters who were then to be made bishops; declaring withal,

that to doubt it was to doubt whether there was any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed churches.

"And even till after the Restoration this notion generally obtained, it being declared 12 Car. II., *That every ecclesiastical person or minister, being ordained by any ecclesiastical persons before the 21st of December last, was to enjoy his benefice if he came into a vacant one;* which it is to be presumed would never have been allowed if ordination by bishops had been thought necessary. And even at this day presbyters with us not only exercise all manner of episcopal jurisdiction, but have, equally with the bishops, a necessary vote in the supreme acts of church government, the making of ecclesiastical laws; and before the Act of Uniformity there was nothing I know of to hinder persons ordained by presbyters from being capable of church preferment, — Francis, Master of the Temple, having no other; and Bishop Morton sent one Calendrini, who was unknown to him, to the ministers of the Walloon Church in London for ordination, who being met in a colloque or synod, did ordain him, and he had a brothership of the Savoy conferred on him as a minister of the Church of England; the account of which may be seen at large in the records of the Walloon Church in London.

"And this ought not to be thought strange, since the Papists at this day allow the ordination of Abbots Sovereign, who are only presbyters, to

be valid and regular; and the famous Alexandrian Church for the first 235 years had no bishops, but who had hands laid on them by presbyters only. Eutych. 'Annals,' Pococke's ed. p. 328; Jerome, 'ad Evagr.,' p. 85. And it is very probable that those bishops who converted so many of our northern parts to Christianity, were ordained by the Abbot of Nye, a presbyter, to whose ecclesiastical jurisdiction Scotland was subject; although some who cannot agree about the person, suppose he had a journeyman bishop to ordain for him. Bed., 'Eccl. Hist.,' lib. iii. *c.* 4; Usser, 'Eccl. Hist.,' prim. org. p. 707. . . .

"'Tis certain, the opinion of bishops being necessary to the Church *did not* prevail, even with the clergy, till the treaties of marriage with Spain and France; but then such unhappy notions generally obtained as tended to disunite Protestants, advance Popery, and establish slavery.

"And when our ambassadors went no longer to Charenton, and other such meetings, and the Laudian faction would no longer own them for churches of Christ, it was then no wonder they suffered persecution; for with what grace could we quarrel with the Papists whom we own to be a true Church, for their sake, whom we accounted no Church!

"And how fatal our breaking off communion with the Reformed churches was to the common Protestant cause, we may learn from our famous

historian, who gives an account (Clarendon's *Hist.*,' vol. 2, pp. 74, 75),—

"'That in the reign of Edward VI., when the Reformed churches were persecuted abroad, great numbers of French, Dutch, and Walloons came over to England with their families, and settled many useful manufactures here; how that king, with great piety and policy, granted them many immunities, the free exercise of their religion, and churches in London, Norwich, and Canterbury, whereby the wealth of those places marvelously increased.' He adds, 'that Queen Elizabeth enlarged their privileges, and made great use of these people in her transactions with France and Holland, and by their means kept up an useful interest in all foreign dominions, where the Protestant religion was tolerated.'

"He then goes on and says: 'That some years before the troubles, when the power of the Churchmen grew more transcendent, and indeed the faculties and understanding of the lay counselors more dull, lazy, and inactive (for without the last the first could have done no hurt), the Church grew jealous that the countenancing of another discipline here by order of the State would at least diminish the reputation and dignity of the Episcopal government, and give countenance to the factious and schismatical party here to expect such a toleration. And therefore the State conniving, or not interposing, the bishops pro-

ceeded against them; so that many left the kingdom, to the lessening the manufacture there of kerseys and narrow cloths; and what was worse, the transporting the mystery into foreign ports.'

"He further shows, that whereas our ambassadors and foreign ministers, in any part where the Reformed religion was exercised, frequented their churches, gave all possible countenance to their profession; and particularly the ambassador at Paris had constantly frequented the Church at Charenton, whereby he kept up necessary correspondence with the most active and powerful persons of that persuasion, to the great benefit of this kingdom, by being let into their secrets of state, and deriving all necessary intelligence from them; the contrary to all this was then practiced, and some advertisements, if not instructions, given to the ambassadors there, to forbear any extraordinary commerce with men of that profession; and the Lord Scudamore, then ambassador, not only declined going to Charenton, but furnished his own chapel with such ornaments (to wit, candles on the communion table, and the like) as gave great offense and umbrage to those of the Reformation there who had not seen the like; besides, he was careful to publish that the Church of England looked not on the Huguenots as part of their communion, which, my Lord Clarendon says, was too much and too industriously discoursed at home." (p. 337).

"And this favorite author of High Church, through the whole course of his history, cannot forbear owning, that almost the whole body of the people, as well as the inferior clergy, were scandalized and offended at the behavior of the bishops and their followers, which was then thought to have a tendency to Popery, especially the worse part of it, — the dominion and tyranny of the clergy; and it was this which drew so many petitions and remonstrances from several Parliaments, both in England and Scotland, all aloud complaining that Popery was fomented and encouraged, and the Protestants persecuted and oppressed, by those very laws designed against the Papists; nor was this the opinion only of the people at home, but of the Protestant churches abroad, who all took part against the king on that account. And my Lord Clarendon, notwithstanding all his palliating, is forced to own that the bishops, by this extraordinary conduct of persecuting the Protestant churches at home, and by separating from the foreign churches abroad, did it with a design, *if not to unite with the common adversary*, yet to show their good inclinations. And those ridiculous innovations, brought into the Church by Laud, could have no other end than to make our separation greater from other Protestants, and to bring us to a nearer conformity to the Church of Rome, but the people not enduring those innovations, it put a stop to further attempts of that kind."

Elsewhere he writes: "Our first Reformers were as Low for church, as they were High for religion. And as they owned all for their brethren who separated from the errors of Popery, howmuchsoever they differed from them in forms of ecclesiastical government; so they did what was possible to root all claim in the clergy to an independent power. . . . 'T was by virtue of this communion of saints which obtained among the Reformers, that they so justly censured the uncharitableness of the Papists. But are the Highflyers, who confine the Church of Christ to a smaller number, and are so far from communicating with other Reformed churches either at home or abroad, that they claim those who do so as schismatics and heretics, more charitable? Is not this acting in defiance of the Apostles' Creed, which requires communion of saints; except they suppose the Catholic Church in so deplorable a condition, as that there are no saints except among themselves?"

With reference to Cranmer, this author writes, on p. 178: "That great Reformer and glorious martyr, Archbishop Cranmer (at a consult of the most eminent divines of the nation, in 1540, where, to avoid the inconvenience of verbal disputes, they gave their opinions in writing), affirms: 'That the ceremonies and solemnities used in admitting bishops and priests, are not of necessity, but only for good order and seeming fashion,

and that there is no more promise of God that grace is given in committing of the ecclesiastical than civil office. He that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest (between whom, he says, there was at first no distinction), needs no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereunto is sufficient.' "

There is no proof that Cranmer ever changed his mind on this subject. We have shown it was the view of the Alexandrian Church, as it was, most probably, of all the Primitive churches.

On p. 349, we have this interesting statement: "It was thought so little a crime for laymen to preach in Queen Elizabeth's time, that, as Dr. Langham and Mr. Fuller report, the High Sheriff of Oxford, Mr. Tavernour, with his gold chain about his neck, and his sword by his side, preached before the University of Oxford in St. Mary's; and that he did, not out of ostentation, but of charity to the scholars. So that the University have as little reason as the Presbyterians to preach up the necessity of being united to a bishop; and they are, though they rail at the thing, at the best but occasional conformists when they communicated with churches subject to bishops. And nothing can better show the sense of the clergy in former times as to these points, than modeling the University after this manner."

This volume shows clearly how the same controversies are reproduced in after ages, and that the weakness of human nature makes true the old adage, that, "Eternal vigilance is the price of religious and civil liberty."

The work here quoted, at first published anonymously, was afterwards known to be written by Matthew Tindal, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. Tindal declared his object in writing, was "to defend the Church of England against the Papists, Jacobites and other High-fliers, and to promote the spiritual as well as temporal welfare of mankind."

At first a High Churchman, he afterwards joined the Church of Rome, stating, "that upon his High Church notions a separation from the Church of Rome could not be justified." Becoming enlightened as to the falsity of the claims of that Church, he returned to the Church of England. He wrote in defence of the Revolution of 1688, and of the Liberty of the Press.

Of the work here quoted, Leclerc, the eminent Protestant divine, said in commendation, "that it was one of the solidest defences of Protestantism ever written." Tindal, like some of the clergy of his time, embraced deistical principles in his old age. But his later defection cannot affect the learning and arguments of this remarkable book.

APPENDIX B.

CONFIRMATORY EVIDENCE.

THROUGH the kindness of a friend who has recently imported the book, the attention of the writer has been directed to a volume of singular interest and value, entitled "Whose are the Fathers? By John Harrison, Curate of Pitsmoor, Sheffield. London: 1867, pp. 728." In it are given a catena of fifty-four Fathers of the first six centuries, with three later writers, together with thirty-seven divines of the Church of England of the Reformation period and later, all more or less bearing on the questions concerning the Church and ministry, at present in dispute. In fullness we have seen nothing equal to it. Let our laymen of worldly means give this and similar works a wide circulation!

We make a few extracts from writers not hitherto quoted, and bearing on our subject.

On p. 226 we read: "But Jerome does give some account of a person in some respect superior to an ordinary presbyter from the time of St. Mark: 'For at Alexandria,'" etc.

"Mr. Percival says: 'Observe, the utmost that can be made of this passage, by itself, is, that presbyters at Alexandria had a voice in the appointment of the patriarch, which, in other places, rested with the bishop of the province, and even this is not distinctly stated. Jerome does not say the bishop was chosen *by* the presbyters, but from among them, nor does he say *by whom* he was placed in the higher degree.'

"Mr. Palmer also states: 'But St. Jerome does not *say* that the bishop thus elected was not afterwards consecrated by bishops.' (B. vi. ch. iv. vol. ii. p. 314.)

"Both Percival and Palmer would fain make a fool of this learned presbyter. For, if bishops performed their parts, as was customary in the time of Jerome, in these promotions of all these Alexandrian bishops, where could have been the relevancy of his referring to them? Let the whole of the Epistle of Jerome to Evagrius be well considered as given above, and the reader will be quite certain that the promotion of the Alexandrian bishop, whatever it was, came from the presbyters, and that bishops, such as existed in the time of Jerome, had no part in it. This is strongly confirmed both by Amalarius and Eutychius.

"Nothing can be plainer from the context than that Jerome teaches that the bishop was chosen *by* the presbyters, though he does not use the exact

words: 'Just as deacons may elect one of themselves . . . and call him archdeacon,' so did the presbyters choose one of themselves, and name him bishop. Mr. Palmer so translates the passage, 'The presbyters always chose one of themselves.'

"Amalarius did not consider the presbyter so promoted to be a bishop at all, in the modern sense of the term. Hence he adduced the case as relating to the consecration of presbyters, and having adduced it, remarks: 'The consecration of an archdeacon is well known to us. An archdeacon has the same consecration as the others have, but by the election of his brethren he is placed first.'

"It is plain Amalarius understood that this Alexandrian presbyter, placed in a higher rank, and called bishop, had no consecration different from his brethren."

AMALARIUS.

The writer, here introduced for the first time, was not, according to Chalmers, Amalarius, Archbishop of Treves, but Amalarius Symphosius, who, according to the "New American Encyclopædia," flourished in the eighth century, and was a Roman Catholic writer of great influence in France.

Quoting Jerome, Amalarius proceeds: "Let us see why the name of presbyter passed over to that of bishop. Ambrose says, on the Epistle to

Timothy, 'But what is the cause? . . . The blessed Apostles having departed, in subsequent times, they who were ordained after them to rule the churches could not compare with those chiefs; nor had they the testimony of miracles equal to them, but seemed also in many other things to be inferior to them. They thought it to be a weighty affair to claim to themselves the name of the Apostles, therefore they divided the names, and some of them left the name of the presbytership to the presbyters. But others who were endued with the power of ordination were called bishops, so that they might most fully know that they were the rulers of the churches.'

"Jerome explains, 'What more has a bishop than a presbyter,' saying in the Epistle to Evagrius, often repeated, 'For what does a bishop do, except in the case of ordination, which a presbyter may not do?' And he explains by what appointment a bishop should be appointed, in his tract upon Titus, saying, 'Therefore, as presbyters know that it is by the custom of the Church that they are to be subject to him that is placed over them, so let the bishop know that they are above presbyters rather by custom than divine appointment,' etc. . . .

"According to the authority of the Fathers, that is to say, the Apostle Paul, Ambrose the Archbishop, and Jerome the Presbyter, the consecra-

tion for a bishop to sacrifice was made in the ordination of a presbyter.

"The office of bishop and priest is almost one." ("Whose are the Fathers," pp. 599, 600.)

Harrison quotes, moreover, the Bishop of Seville, A. D. 600: "To presbyters as well as to bishops is committed the dispensing of the mysteries of God; they are set over the churches of Christ, and in the mingling of the body and blood of Christ, they are alike with the bishops, and in the office of preaching to the people; only for the greater honor of the bishop, and preventing schisms, the power of ordination was restricted to him."

Also, he quotes the Canon Law: "A bishop is the same as a presbyter, and by custom alone bishops are over presbyters — as Jerome saith. . . . A bishop should not regard himself as a lord, but as a colleague of the presbyters."

The Fourth Council of Carthage, A. D. 398, "In whatsoever place the bishop sits, it is not allowed the presbyters to stand. The bishop may sit on a higher seat in the church, and in the session of the presbyters; but within the house should regard himself as a colleague of the presbyters."

TOSTATUS.

An important extract is given from the works of Tostatus, Bishop of Avila in the fifteenth century, as quoted by the celebrated Huguenot Claude, to show that this writer held that episco-

pal power came from the Church and not from consecration by prelates: "That it is the same in the keys of the Church, that Jesus Christ gave them to the whole Church in the person of St. Peter, and that it is the Church that communicates them to the prelates, but which, notwithstanding, communicates them without depriving itself of them; so that the Church has them in respect of origin and virtue, and the prelates have them in respect of use; the Church has them virtually because she can give them to a prelate by election, and she has them originally also. For the power of a prelate does not take its origin from itself, but from the Church, by means of the election that it makes of him. The Church that chose him gives him that jurisdiction, but as for the Church, it receives it from nobody after its having once received it from Jesus Christ. The Church, therefore, has the keys originally and virtually, and whensoever she gives them to a prelate, she does not give them to him after the manner she has them, to wit, originally and virtually, but she gives them to him only as to use." (In "Numer." cap. xv. quest. 48, 49.)

This Roman writer takes the view of the Alexandrian Church, that the authority of the bishop comes from his *election*, not the mistaken view of many, that the consecration by the hands of other bishops confers it, — an error which has led to so much division and evil in the Church.

After a thorough examination of all that the Fathers have written on succession, this able writer thus gives his conclusions: —

HARRISON.

"We believe that a moderate Episcopacy is more in accordance with Scripture and antiquity than any other form of church government. Our own views on this point will be given in a distinct chapter. . . . It is true, as we have seen, that the person who among his fellow-presbyters was a *primus inter pares*, in process of time, and especially in the fourth century, became developed into one who had absolute authority over the presbyters. But we believe that the Church, in departing so generally, if not universally from primitive practice, departed also from that which was of divine institution." . . .

"At present it is sufficient for our purpose to show that the doctrine of apostolical succession as held by these Anglicans, has no foundation in the present ordinal. The ordinal itself does not teach it. . . .

"It is not to be doubted that there has been a succession of bishops, and presbyters, and deacons, and laity, from the time that some apostle or apostolic man laid the foundation of a Christian Church in this country. But this is not what these Anglicans mean by succession. There had been in these realms, from a very re-

mote period, a succession of kings, with more or less interruption. But this is not the kind of succession held by these Anglicans. For this, in the strictest sense, is hereditary; whereas in the succession of bishops, there is no hereditary title to the office; for the series of bishops has not followed the line of any family or class of Christians, but has been taken indiscriminately from the mass. If then none of these senses can be attributed to this Anglican succession, what does it really mean? As far as its meaning can be obtained from the mists of confusion and the mazes of sophistry, it denotes an unbroken continuation of the commission first given to the Apostles, accompanied with a certain exclusive spiritual aptitude contained in the transferred commission to discharge the office of an apostle, in modern times called a bishop; and this aptitude, or spiritual qualification, is supposed to be transmitted in unbroken continuity from one bishop to another, through the channel of a form called ordination. It will be found that the Fathers, though they occasionally use the terms equivalent to 'succession' and 'successors,' have not given the remotest hint that by these terms they mean what these Anglicans mean by them. . . .

"These Fathers (Tertullian and Epiphanius) did not place the validity of the Christian ministry upon the supposed uninterrupted succession of any class of men from the Apostles, which, in

fact, is a fanciful and comparatively modern notion, and was unknown to the Fathers of the first six centuries. . . . The succession they appealed to in the apostolic churches, was not a succession of men deriving a commission from the Apostles through an unbroken line of ordainers, but a succession of pastors, each one entering into the vacated charge of his predecessor, and all maintaining the Christian doctrine; and this fact of succession they used as an argument against the novel opinions of the heretics of their time.

"But certain Anglo-Catholics lay the whole stress upon a succession of men receiving a commission from the Apostles in an unbroken line, and suppose an indelible character fixed upon them, which neither heresy in doctrine, idolatry in worship, immorality in life, nor schism in practice, can efface. The Fathers, and Irenæus in particular, did not consider even their own kind of succession as a necessary mark of a true or Catholic *Church;* they rather urged it as an argument of the truth of their *doctrine*."

THE VIA MEDIA.

Speaking of the exclusive successionists, Harrison forcibly remarks: "By a favorite expression they define their position to be *via media*, that is, *midway* between Lambeth and the Vatican, Canterbury and Rome. The fact is, they want to be at Rome without leaving Canterbury. The

golden cords that bind some of them to the latter place, are five thousand five hundred fold strong, as well as other ties equally binding on the less ethereal part of human nature. To adopt, then, the Romish theory of apostolical succession would be to make their present position an open disguise to their consciences. So they have adopted their *via media*, or *via sua* theory of succession, by which the more substantial part of their nature can be at Canterbury and their souls at Rome. . . . In fact, they are a *via media* offspring of two opposing qualities, like their father, Archbishop Laud. But what is most marvelous is, that these hybrids should increase, and instead of becoming less incongruous to the mixture of their natures, should become more so. But it should be borne in mind that we are speaking of what is moral and not what is physical, and that there is no accounting for the freaks of the human mind when it once becomes unhinged. As good Bishop Hall addressed Laud, their father, so we, in the same words, address his still more degenerate offspring : —

"'I would I knew where to find you; then I could tell how to take a direct aim; whereas now I must rove and conjecture. To-day you are in the tents of the Romanists; to-morrow, in ours; the next day, between both, against both. Our adversaries think you ours; we, theirs; your conscience finds you with both and neither. . . .

Cast off either your wings or your teeth; clothing this bat-like nature, be either a bird or a beast. . . . God cryeth with Jehu, "Who is on my side, who?" Look at last out at your window to Him, and in a resolute courage, cast down this Jezebel that hath bewitched you.'"

We earnestly commend this book to all who desire a thorough exposure of the sophistries by which Pusey, Palmer, Percival, Hook, Sewell, Wordsworth, Keble, the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, have poisoned and perverted the minds of the clergy of our Church. Here will be found all the patristic authorities, and a complete answer to this whole scheme of diluted and modified Popery, which has slidden off the base of the Reformation, and is surely approaching the slough out of which our martyred Reformers dragged and purged it. May God give us the spirit, and preserve to us the principles of those heroes and saints of whom the world was not worthy.

APPENDIX C.

FURTHER LAY TESTIMONY.

We have met with a work of such value by a layman of the Church of England, that we cannot forbear to present a few extracts from it. This work is for the laity, for on them, we think, as Bishop Griswold often remarked, now rests, as far as man is concerned, the only hope for our Church. This volume is entitled, "Essays on the Church. By a Layman. pp. 486. Seeley & Burnside, London, 1840." The dangers which threaten our Church from the Sacramentarian and Traditionary party are here calmly and thoroughly considered.

The writer says: "Most entirely and unreservedly, then, may we assent to the decisions and practice of the Church of England, with reference to the episcopal form of church government. But with equal satisfaction may we accompany her in her cautious abstinence from dogmatism, as well as in her simple following of the footsteps of the Apostles,

"Using her own liberty with the greatest discretion, she was not inclined to refuse the same freedom to other churches, or to prescribe rules of Christian communion of a stricter kind than those set forth in Holy Writ. And therefore it is that, while she adopts and prefers the episcopal form herself, —

"II. *She carefully abstains from making Episcopacy an indispensable requisite in a Christian Church.*

"Her cautious abstinence on this point cannot be ascribed to inadvertence, or the absence of occasion. When the Articles of the Church of England were drawn up, discussed, and finally settled, the question of Episcopacy was one of the most prominent topics of discussion among theologians. In the neighboring kingdom of Scotland, and in several of the Protestant churches of the Continent, the government by bishops had been discontinued. The English Church adopted a different course, and adhered to that form of Church order. In forming her articles, or confession of faith, the question must needs have occurred, 'Whether Episcopacy was to be regarded as *essential*, and therefore to be included in that formulary; or as merely expedient, and therefore passed over in silence?' This question, we know, *did* occur, *was* brought under the consideration of the framers of our Confession, and was decided according to the latter of these two views. We

learn from Bishop Burnet, that in framing the 23d Article, which describes *those* ministers to be 'lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work' — *not* by *bishops of the apostolic succession*, but by *men who have public authority given unto them* in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard. We learn from Bishop Burnet that 'those who drew it *had the state of the several churches before their eyes*, that had been differently reformed' from our own. He adds, 'The general words in which this part of the article is framed seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.' And herein we can unreservedly approve the judgment of our Reformers, inasmuch as it exactly coincides with that of Holy Writ. The Church leaves the question precisely where the Bible leaves it.

"This moderate and cautious view of the question, however, is not at all palatable to the modern race of High Churchmen. With them, Episcopacy is nothing less than a divine law, a positive and distinctly enunciated institution of Christ; an institution, too, of universal obligation, under all possible variety of circumstances; and, in fact, an indispensable condition, an essential point, in the very being of a Christian Church. And, of course, if it be of this rank, it follows that disobedience to it is not only criminal, but highly dangerous."

After quoting from Dr. Pusey's writings his opinion, that none but an Episcopal minister could administer the communion, and that, — "referring to 'non-episcopal societies,' — as there is hope for the unconverted heathen, there may be also a *similar hope* for the Presbyterians and Lutherans," this author proceeds to give the language of the best divines of the English Church, in which is presented the moderate view of the 23d Article.

Among others, he quotes Dean Field, Archbishops Whitgift, Parker, Grindal, Cranmer, Usher, Wake, Synge, Secker, and Howley; also Bishops Hall, Andrewes, Tomline, and Bloomfield, with Hooker and Bacon. "And thus," he says, "from Cranmer down to the present hour, we find one unbroken line of witnesses to the fact, and of supporters of the principle, that the Church of England, to use Mr. Keble's own words, 'thinks it enough to assert that the government of archbishops and bishops is *ancient* and *allowable*, without attempting to assert its *exclusive* claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the sacraments.'"

Our author proceeds: "And this is the wisest, because the safest, ground to take. The moment stricter and more lofty pretensions are urged, difficulties and questions begin to open upon us. Human nature, indeed, blind to its own innate and irremovable imperfection, is very fond of

seeking that unattainable possession, a perfect human institution. When the circle has been squared, when the atmosphere has been brought under rule, when the musical scale shall be perfected, then may we begin to dream of a human society of faultless symmetry. Meanwhile let us be sure that the admission of a Judas among the Apostles of our all-seeing Lord, and of a Demas among the fellow-laborers of the chief of the Apostles, were both designed to yield instruction to future ages. Above all, let us remember that the only 'laying on of hands' recorded to have been received by Paul himself, was that of a 'certain disciple' (Acts ix. 17), and that while he evidently places the preaching of the Word above baptism, as the higher and more important function (1 Cor. i. 17), we find it said that '*they*,' without any distinction, '*which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled, preaching the Word*' (Acts xi. 19).

"The *principle*, then, should be ORDER; the *regulator*, a CATHOLIC SPIRIT. Those who would strain matters to an extremity, and strive to frame, out of human weakness, folly, and infirmity, a perfect system, are merely copying the builders of old, who essayed, out of Babylonish bricks and the slime of Shinar, to build a tower '*whose top might reach unto heaven.*' The Allwise rebuked their overweening pride and arrogant attempt by 'confounding their language;' and a like fate

attends the efforts of those who, in our own times, would rather side with Bonner and Gardiner, two prelates in 'the holy apostolic line,' 'in making havoc of the Church,' than with the Presbyterian Knox, in building up a spiritual temple of God, by the instrumentality of which '*there were added to the church daily of such as should be saved.*' . . .

"And let those who cannot be content with this general and catholic view take care, in their further inquiries, to discriminate carefully between two things, which are often very irrationally intermingled, namely, the *unbroken succession*, and the *form of church government.*

"These two things are perfectly distinct from each other, and yet the question is often argued as if they were so conjoined that the decision of either must decide both. (Here the clear head of this layman stands out so strongly in contrast with the confused utterances of extravagant ecclesiastics!) But the erroneousness of this supposition is seen in the fact that many firm supporters of an unbroken apostolic succession are also stanch maintainers of the Presbyterian scheme of government. They tell us that the Apostles constituted the Christian Church, ordaining elders (or presbyters) in every place, and that each local church was governed by these elders or presbyters. The existence in some cases of an overseer, or delegate of an Apostle, as in the cases of Timothy and Titus, they do not admit to es-

tablish a general rule. But still, while they adhere to Presbyterianism, they maintain, as firmly as the highest Episcopalian, the necessity of a *commission*, handed down in regular and unbroken *succession* from the Apostles, to enable any man lawfully to exercise the ministerial office.

"The number, then, of those who contend for the *succession* is much larger than of those who consider that such succession can only exist in the line of the *episcopacy*. And this was to be expected. Every man's reason, and the obvious fitness of things, is against the idea that the Christian ministry is an office and function which it is at any man's option, at any moment and under any circumstances, to confer upon himself.

"The Church of England, therefore, in this matter, speaks clearly and decidedly: 'It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same.' (Art. xxiii.) But when she comes to define the term 'lawfully called,' she is far less positive. She says that 'we ought to judge those to be lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.' Here she deliberately refuses, — for there is no other view to be taken of it, — she *refuses* to assert that those only

are lawfully commissioned who have received episcopal ordination. Adopting Episcopacy itself, as the best system of church government, and as a system, the foundation of which she can trace in the apostolic writings, she yet refuses to assert that it is only from episcopal hands that the commission to preach the gospel can be lawfully received.

"It was the judgment of her founders — perhaps unanimously, but at all events generally — that the bishop of the Primitive Church was merely a presiding elder, a presbyter ruling over presbyters; identical in order and commission; superior only in degree and authority. Cranmer's recorded 'opinion and sentence' (though on this, as well as on other questions, his mind underwent various changes) was, 'that bishops and priests were not two things, but were both *one office* in the beginning of Christ's religion.'

"The judgment and the practice of Archbishops Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift we have already noticed; and Mr. Palmer, as we have seen, confesses that it was the opinion of Jewel, Hooker, and Field, 'that a mere presbyter might confer every order except the episcopate;' in other words, that the *apostolic succession* of the presbyters might be continued *by presbyters*, the episcopate being laid aside or lost. . . .

"Common sense, if we could banish the schoolmen, the councils, and the system-makers, . . .

would tell us, — Rest not in long descent, or in indubitable succession from the Apostles, or in general concurrence with the whole body of Christians, or in any other external marks! Christ founded a Church; He commissioned a body of preachers of His gospel, and He left them a few plain and simple rules. Try every church, then, that professes to be following His injunctions, by the record and injunction He has left: *To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.*'

"And such is the course distinctly pointed out in Scripture. Not a syllable is there to tell us that a divine commission, regularly transmitted in strict succession, or an external unity of profession, is to be our guide in reposing our confidence in a priesthood or a church. Nothing could be clearer than the divine institution of the Old Testament priesthood; and yet, how many threatenings and reproaches does God Himself direct against these, his commissioned ministers!"

Then, quoting largely from the Scriptures of both covenants, our author proceeds: "Many other passages might be adduced, if space permitted, to show that the grand point pressed by all the Apostles was, *continuance in sound doctrine.* This was with them the chief note or mark of a true or faithful church. . . .

"The *one question*, then, in the Scriptures,

touching any church, is, *Is it faithful?* — faithful to the *doctrine* intrusted to its care? Is the gospel preached the same gospel which the Apostles declared, or is it 'another gospel,' against which St. Paul fulminated his anathemas? *This* is the chief and almost the only point suggested in Holy Writ as the mark or note of a true church."

Our author sustains his view by quoting the two Reformers of greatest influence, Bishops Ridley and Jewel. We leave him here, with the remark that his work will repay the most careful perusal of any one who would read a thorough examination and exposure of the errors which now are spreading through our Church.

"Bishop Ridley, in his second conference, quotes Chrysostom to this effect: 'In times past, there were many ways to know the Church of Christ, that is to say, by good life, by miracles, by charity, by doctrine, by ministering the sacraments. But from the time that heresies took hold of the churches, it is *only known by the Scriptures which is the true Church.* They have all things in *outward show*, which the true Church hath in truth. They have temples like unto ours,' etc., etc., wherefore only by the Scriptures do we know which is the true Church.'

"Bishop Jewel says: 'Our Lord, knowing that there should be such confusion of things in the latter days, commandeth that Christians, who live

in the profession of Christian faith, and are desirous to settle themselves upon a sure ground of faith, should go to *no other thing but the Scriptures.*' 'But whereas they (the Papists) make the Holy Scriptures like silent masses, *dumb* and useless; and appeal rather to God Himself, *speaking in the Church* and in councils, that is, *to their own senses and opinions;* that is a very uncertain and dangerous way of finding out truth, and in a sort *fanatical.*'" ("Essays on the Church," pp. 227–51, 151–52.)

DR. IRA WARREN.

We turn now to the testimony of an American layman, who has written a work of great research and value, entitled, "The Causes and Cure of Puseyism. By Ira Warren. Boston, 1847."

On p. 258 he writes: "My conviction is that *government*, civil and ecclesiastical, is of divine appointment; but that its particular *form*, in the one case as in the other, has not been made the subject of any positive divine enactment, but has been left to the molding, under Divine Providence, of times and circumstances, in accordance with the wants of the race in its various moral and physical conditions.

"I believe, therefore, that the preface of the Prayer Book is right in referring to discipline all things not clearly included under the term 'doctrine,' and in declaring that, without exception,

they are — Episcopacy and the form of church government of course included — *alterable at the pleasure of the Church.* I have never seen the fact that our Church takes this ground before stated; but here it is in the Prayer Book. It cannot be evaded.

"The exclusive views growing out of the divine right of Episcopacy have no support, then, either in the Bible or in the Prayer Book. No real progress can be made towards the cure of Puseyism, until evangelical men shall have discarded from their minds every vestige of the divine right of Episcopacy.

"Moreover, if we would get rid of our tractarian tendencies, we must cultivate Christian union. We must abandon all our lofty notions, and step right upon the platform of Christian brotherhood, taking every Christian man by the hand as a brother and an equal, and, according to the true gospel rule, esteeming others better than ourselves. The spirit of the age demands this of us. Without it we shall, in the great race of love and charity, on which the Protestant Church is entering so earnestly, be left far in the rear. Our own life as a denomination demands it of us. Without it, we shall be thrown practically, in spite of us, into the society and fellowship of the apostate Church of Rome. Our loyalty to Christ requires it of us. Without it, our position will more and more be found, of necessity, to be one of antagonism to Him and His cause."

In his preface (page 12), this author writes: Having studied, to some extent, the history, doctrines, formularies, and usages of the Episcopal Church, I find there are many things which, in my humble opinion, ought to be reformed or given up, but which are growing worse and worse, with no prospect of amendment, unless those in high places can be reached with reproofs which we have all hitherto failed to apply, either for want of courage or lack of the means of doing so. . . .

"My aim, therefore, in the following pages, is to reach the laity, and to press upon their attention a succession of topics, which, by great effort, and to the manifest injury of our denomination, have been kept out of view. No doubt the theme, to many of our people, will be a new one, but not, I trust, the less inviting on that account. If I am not mistaken, it will awaken the more attention from the care with which it has hitherto been concealed. At any rate, my desire is to see it awaken a general concern among us for the purity of the gospel. I would have an interest in this matter reach all the borders of our denomination, and the General Convention made to feel so heavy a pressure of public sentiment from without, and so imperative a prompting from within, as to be willing to take the matter in hand, and *revise the Liturgy, making it thoroughly Protestant. . . .*

"Bishop Griswold, the wisest man our Church in this country has ever had, and who was better acquainted than any other man with the condition and prospects of the Episcopal churches in New England, thus speaks in his Address delivered before the Convention of the Eastern Diocese in 1837: 'The prejudice in these Eastern States against forms of prayer, and *the objections so generally made to some parts of ours particularly*, and to the length of our morning service, *are powerful obstacles to our increase*. . . . When there shall have been *a judicious revision of our Liturgy*, in the manner wisely recommended by our venerable brother, Bishop White, deceased, I doubt not but our *churches will more rapidly increase*.'

"To these testimonies of our first two presiding bishops, we may add the emphatic words of a kindred spirit, the late Archbishop Sumner: 'Let me remove twenty words from the Prayer Book, and in one day I will reunite to the Church twenty thousand dissenters.'"

On this point, our author quotes on his title-page the strong language of another eminent Episcopal layman, Isaac Taylor: "How little did the venerable men — the martyrs of the English Church — imagine what they were doing, and what a harvest for their country they were preparing, when, from a mistaken anxiety to conciliate the adherents of the ancient idolatry, they professed their submission to the very authors of that idolatry,

and admitted into the constitution they formed, the roots of the ancient delusion, and the germs of an after growth of polytheism!"

LORD BACON.

We close the testimony of these noble lay brethren with the words of the most distinguished man of the age in which our Prayer Book was revised and settled, one thoroughly familiar with the principles upon which his Church was based, and with the great men who reformed it, Lord Francis Bacon.

He writes: "For the second point, that there should be but one form of discipline in all churches, and that imposed by necessity of commandment and prescript out of the Word of God, it is a matter volumes have been compiled of, and therefore cannot receive a brief redargution. I for my part do confess, that in searching the Scriptures I could never find any such thing, but that God hath left the like liberty to the church government as he hath done to the civil government; to be varied according to time, place, and accident, which nevertheless His high and divine providence doth order and dispose. . . . So likewise in church matters, the substance of doctrine is immutable; and so are the general rules of government; but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and discipline of churches, they be left at large; and, therefore, it

is good we return to the ancient bounds of unity in the Church of God, which was one faith, one baptism, and not one hierarchy, one discipline."

Speaking of the party which, when he wrote (1609), under Bancroft, Andrewes, and Laud, were gradually advancing more extreme views, Bacon continues: "The other part, which maintaineth the present government of the Church, hath not kept one tenor neither. First, those ceremonies which were pretended to be corrupt, they maintained to be things indifferent, and opposed the examples of the good times of the Church to that challenge which was made unto them, because they were used in the later superstitious times. Then they were also content mildly to acknowledge many imperfections in the Church, as tares come up amongst the corn; which yet, according to the wisdom taught by our Saviour, were not with strife to be pulled up, lest it might spoil and supplant the good corn, but to grow on together till the harvest.

"After, they grow to a more absolute defence and maintenance of all the orders of the Church, and stiffly to hold that nothing was to be innovated, partly because it would make a breach upon the rest. Hence, exasperated through contentions, they are fallen to a direct condemnation of the contrary part, as of a sect. Yea, and some indiscreet persons have been bold, in open preaching, to use dishonorable and derogatory speech

and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far, as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be unlawful ministers. Thus we see the beginnings were modest, but the extremes are violent, so as there is almost as great a distance now of either side from itself, as was at first the one from the other. . . .

"To my lords the bishops I say, that it is hard for them to avoid blame in the opinion of an indifferent person, in standing so precisely upon altering nothing. Laws, not refreshed with new laws, wax sour. Without a change of ill, a man cannot continue the good. To take away many abuses supplanteth not good orders, but establisheth them. A contentious retaining of custom is a turbulent thing as well as innovation. A good husbandman is ever pruning in his vineyard or in his field — not unseasonably indeed, not unskilfully, but lightly; he findeth ever somewhat to do. . . .

"But if it be said to me, that there is a difference between civil causes and ecclesiastical, they may as well tell me that churches and chapels need no reparations, though castles and houses do; whereas, commonly to speak truth, dilapidations of the inward and spiritual edifications of the Church of God are, in all times, as great as the outward and material. Sure I am, that the very word and style of reformation used by our

Saviour, *Ab initio non fuit sic*, was applied to church matters, and those of the highest nature, concerning the law moral." ("Considerations concerning the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England." By Francis, Lord Bacon.)

How remarkably is the history of the Church of England reproduced in our own day! May we have grace to see it, and profit by the experience of the past!

We venture the assertion that there is more scriptural truth, sound philosophy, and true churchmanship, as to the point in question, in the words of these five learned and judicious laymen we have given — Garrat, Bowdler, Warren, Bacon, and the author of the Essays — than in all the volumes written by the Tractarians, Ritualists, and their followers, English and American, for the last generation.

O Almighty God, who hast built Thy Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone; grant us so to be joined together in *unity of Spirit by their doctrine*, that we may be made a holy temple acceptable unto Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.—*Collect for St. Simon and St. Jude's Day.*

THE TRUE HISTORIC EPISCOPATE:

THE PRIMITIVE EIRENICON.

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

CONCERNING

THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION

OF THE

CHURCH OF ALEXANDRIA,

AND

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EPISCOPATE.

PART II.

BY

REV. MASON GALLAGHER.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

OF THE

REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH

ADOPTED DECEMBER 2D, 1873.

I.

The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding "the faith once delivered unto the saints," declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as the Word of God, and the sole rule of faith and practice; in the creed "commonly called the Apostles' Creed;" in the Divine institution of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and in the doctrines of grace substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

II.

This Church recognizes and adheres to Episcopacy, not as of Divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of Church polity.

III.

This Church, retaining a Liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer as it was revised, proposed and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, A. D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge and amend the same, as may seem most conductive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of the faith be kept entire."

IV.

This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word:

First. That the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity.

Second. That Christian ministers are "priests" in another sense than that in which all believers are "a royal priesthood."

Third. That the Lord's Table is an altar on which the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father.

Fourth. That the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a presence in the elements of bread and wine.

Fifth. That Regeneration is inseparably connected with Baptism.

PART II.

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE.

EXAMINATION OF OBJECTIONS BY REV. CHARLES GORE.

This author, examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, in his late elaborate work on "The Christian Ministry," examines Jerome's statements, and here concedes the point, that Jerome regarded the office of bishop as of human arrangement, and confirmed his view by the practice of the Church of Alexandria. He thus writes:

"The language of this statement is ambiguous, but Jerome seems to mean by later Latin writers, that there was no fresh consecration or ordination required in earlier days at Alexandria to make a presbyter bishop, but that he became bishop simply in virtue of his election by presbyters. There would have been thus a substantial identity between the two orders.

"Jerome had, of course, resided at Alexandria, and had had opportunities of making himself

acquainted with Alexandrian traditions; but if this is his meaning, his statement is wholly without independent support in Latin or Greek literature." To sustain his points, he refers to Epiphanius (a bishop), who in his writings neglects to mention the Alexandrian arrangement. He refers also to the case of Colluthus, which transpired after a change in Alexandrian customs; and also to Origen, who lived after the change noted, and who, he thought it most probable, would have noticed the singularity of Alexandrian elections. He goes on to say: "It requires thus a great effort of confidence to trust Jerome's witness, especially when we consider that it is the witness of Jerome in a temper, and that under such circumstances he is not too careful with his facts; but it has been so generally accepted by western writers from the fourth to the twelfth century, and by modern critics, that it would be the better course, as our object is not merely archaeological, to face what is at any rate the possibility of its being true. . . . . Elsewhere there were two distinct ordinations; one making a man a bishop, and another a presbyter; at Alexandria there was only one ordination, which made a man a presbyter, and a potential bishop. When this arrangement ceased, and Alexandria was as-

similated to other Churches, and presbyters began to be ordained as mere presbyters," etc.

Gore states in a note that the author of *De divinis officiis*, and Amalarius, bishop of Treves, c. A. D. 820. de Eccles. Off. ii. 13: "both treat this state of things at Alexandria as an instance of a substantial, original identity in the office of bishops and priests, indicated by the same officers being called in the New Testament by either name. This comes to them from Jerome and Ambrosiaster whom they quote."

Our author proceeds to criticize Eutychius, whom he regards as less informed with respect to Alexandrian customs than Severus; again presents the omission of Origen to notice the Alexandrian custom, and concludes with the statement that an early work entitled "*Apostolical Christian Ordinances*, seems inconsistent with Eutychius' information." This comprises the sum of the criticism.

He thus concludes: "In the absence of any trustworthy support from Eutychius, there is no strong case for accepting Jerome's statement about the substantial identity of bishops and presbyters in early days in Alexandria, in such sense that no episcopal ordination, but only presbyteral appointment, was required to make a presbyter bishop. If there were many bishops

in Egypt, the supposed ground for this exceptional system is gone," pp. 137–42, 357–63.

No satisfactory argument is here presented for disbelieving Jerome's clear statement with respect to the presbyterian elections and ordinations in Alexandria. The difficulty with this writer and others who hold with him, is that they endeavor to accommodate the customs of the first two centuries, to those changes which were made later by Cyprian and his school of High Churchmen. When these writers can present a solitary case of a *second* ordination of a presbyter in the first two centuries (which has not been done), there would be some basis to their objections to the custom of Alexandria.

On the other hand, as instances are given of men placed in the episcopate with no ordination, as in the case of Fabianus of Rome, the objections offered to the confirmatory evidence of Eutychius fall to the ground. The idea of the episcopate being a distinct *order* from that of the presbyterate was, probably not entertained by Christians before the third century. No evidence of the kind has reached us. To force this idea upon those early ages creates confusion. It had no place there. No exclusive episcopal succession was then known. It grew out of ecclesiastical pride and the subse-

quent absorption of the inherent, Scriptural rights of the presbyterate. It produced the Papacy, and has been the source of schism, and innumerable evils in the Church of Christ.

Hadden, in his work on "Apostolical Succession," p. 122, devotes a few lines to the statements of Jerome and Eutychius; and refers to some "crushing replies," in this connection; but not furnishing them, he presents no argument to be noticed.

Having given all that the latest objectors to the argument for a primitive and moderate episcopacy can offer, additional testimony will be presented, that the custom of the Church of Alexandria is fully known to the great body of the Protestant Church; while the concessions of several of the ablest Episcopal authors, in addition to those already offered, to the same important and interesting ecclesiastical arrangement, will be appended.

It will be seen how futile in this Age, and in this Land, is the attempt to extend the exclusive, hierarchal system, with the Sacerdotal and formal superstitions, which naturally belong to it, and invariably attend it.

TESTIMONIES FROM THE METHODIST COMMUNION.

We have already given the statements of Powell, an English writer, and of Drs. Bangs and Stevens, American Methodists, with respect to the point under consideration; the succession through presbyters in the Primitive Church of Alexandria. As an historic Episcopate has been kindly offered to the Methodists and others, by a Communion which repudiates a presbyterial succession as invalid, and worthless; it remains to show more fully why this largest and most influential of all Protestant denominations, has reason to be fully satisfied with their orders, and how they will regard the offer thus extended by a comparatively small, but highly respectable Denomination.

Dr. Abel Stevens refers in his "Church Polity," p. 116, to the Alexandrian custom as a "complete vindication of Mr. Wesley's ordination in the American Church."

JOHN WESLEY.

In the "Lives of Coke," by Drew and by Sutcliffe, and also in the "Portraiture of Methodism," by Crowther, we have the following words of Wesley to Coke, regarding his ordination by him:

"That as the Revolution in America had

separated the United States from the mother country forever, and the episcopal establishment was utterly abolished, the societies had been represented to him in a most deplorable condition. That an appeal had also been made to him through Mr. Asbury, in which he was requested to provide for them some mode of Church government suited to their exigencies, and that, having long and seriously revolved the subject in his thoughts, he intended to adopt the plan which he was now about to unfold.

"That as he had invariably endeavored, in every step he had taken, to keep as close to the Bible as possible, so, on the present occasion, he hoped he was not about to deviate from it. That keeping his eye upon the conduct of the Primitive Churches in the ages of unadulterated Christianity, he had much admired the mode of ordaining bishops which the Church of Alexandria had practiced.

"That to preserve its purity, that Church would never suffer the interference of a foreign bishop in any of their ordinations, but that the presbyters of that venerable Apostolical Church, on the death of a bishop, exercised the right of ordaining another from their own body by the laying on of their own hands; and that this

practice continued among them for two hundred years to the days of Dionysius.

"And finally, that, being himself a presbyter, he wished Dr. Coke to accept ordination at his hands, and to proceed, in that character, to the Continent of America, to superintend the societies of the United States."

As attempts have been made to show that both Wesley and Coke had doubts as to the validity of this ordination, we quote the language of both: "I firmly believe that I am a scriptural *episcopos*, as much as any man in England or in Europe. For the *uninterrupted succession* I know to be a fable, which no man ever did, or can prove." "I think he (Bishop Stillingfleet) has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor the Apostles prescribed any particular form of Church government, and that the plea of the divine right of episcopacy was never heard of in the Primitive Church." Wks. vol. vii. p. 285. See, also, vol. xvi.

Dr. Coke writes to Mr. Wesley thus: "The more maturely I consider the subject, the more expedient it appears to me that the power of ordaining others should be received by me from you, by the imposition of your hands. . . . I could therefore earnestly wish you would exercise that power in that instance, which I have not the shadow of a doubt but God hath in-

vested you with, for the good of our connection." Moore's Wesley, ii. 276.

BISHOP JOHN EMORY.

This view of the Methodists is also distinctly stated by their eminent Bishop Emory, in his "Defence of our Fathers," p. 58: "We have already referred to the practice of the Church of Alexandria in making their bishops for more than two hundred years. The mode in which some High Church writers attempt to explain Jerome's account of the matter, we are not unapprised of. It would be easy to show that their explanation by no means deprives us, in this case, of the authority of Jerome; and those learned doctors, to use the language of Stillingfleet, who would persuade us, that the presbyters did only make choice of the persons, but the ordination was performed by other bishops, would do well to tell us *first* who and where those bishops were, especially while Egypt remained but one province under the Praefectus Augustalis. But in proof of the correctness of our understanding of the case, we adduce the testimony of the Patriarch of Alexandria himself, who expressly affirms, as we have before quoted, 'that the twelve presbyters,' etc.

"Stillingfleet understood this case, as published by the most learned Selden, precisely in

the same sense; and it is evident that Archbishop Ussher did also." Thus it appears that the Methodist Church appeals to the Primitive precedent, and the Church of Alexandria.

DR. GEORGE PECK.

Rev. George Peck, D. D., in the Meth. Quar. Rev., January 1845, in a review of the Potts and Wainwright controversy of 1844, thus expresses himself with regard to the language of the editor of the Report, Rev. I. C. Richmond. It furnishes further and direct evidence in regard to the view of this great denomination, with respect to their Orders, and how they appreciate the offers of new Orders from High Churchmen:

"It is remarkable that the note-writer, who takes frequent notice of the Methodists, though he sometimes classes them with 'Mormons' and all sorts of fanatics, still arrays against them the Presbyterians, on the side of the *Episcopalians*. Now we protest against this classification.

"The Methodists in this country, have adopted an episcopal form of government, as, according to Archbishop Whateley, they had a perfect right to do. But Methodist Episcopacy is based upon and grows out of the *presbytery*. It is an *official* relation concerted for the

harmonious action of the great itinerant scheme, and the better government of the Church. But it claims no *divine right or apostolical succession*, as these things are understood by High Churchmen, for its basis.

"In the great controversy between Presbyterians and Episcopalians, upon apostolical succession, we symbolize with the former and not with the latter. Our episcopacy is not antagonistic to presbyterianism as we understand it, but is the very modification of it, which *Baxter* and *Gillespie*, and many of the reformers seem to have in their conceptions, but did not realize in history. An exception to this remark, perhaps, should be made of the German Lutherans, who have a *Superintendency* or an *episcopacy* somewhat similar to ours.

"We are not, then, to be ranked among *Episcopalians*, when the great essential elements of their creed, episcopacy *jure divino*, and *a personal succession of bishops from the apostles only having the right of ordination* is taken into account. We are at war with these principles, not because we *would* have, but *cannot* obtain, what our successionists call a legitimate episcopacy, but because we believe this episcopacy to be contrary to Scripture, and destructive of true Christian unity.

"No, gentlemen: we do not want your 'suc-

cession,' we would not thank you for it. We reject it as an usurpation, and would in no case *descend* to accept it at your hands. We understand what a note-writer means by 'the wishes of the Methodists, who would have it if they could, and might if they would.'"

This is sufficiently plain language. This predominant Communion originally based on the Alexandrian principle, which has so greatly outstripped in numbers and strength, its sister Church, which starting in this country under far more promising circumstances, unwisely saddled itself with the feudal principles of Laud and the Stewarts; can never be persuaded to take the back track, and adopt a scheme, which though it may boast of a *succession*, which does not exist, has abundantly proved itself in this age, and country, devoid of *success*.

NON-CONFORMIST TESTIMONY.

JOSIAH CONDER.

In addition to the statements already given of Non-Episcopalians of Great Britain, we present the argument of Josiah Conder, a layman of great ability, an editor and author, who in his work on "Protestant Non-conformity," writes: "Of the existence of a 'college of elders,' as it is termed, acting in concert with the presiding pastor or arch-presbyter, there are undoubted traces in the annals of the early ages. Ignatius terms the presbyters 'the Sanhedrim of the Church.' Other Fathers allude to them under the title of *clergy*. Jerome speaks of them as the Senate or Common Council, by whom the Church was governed. Eutychius remarks that there were twelve presbyters who constituted the government of the Church of Alexandria. . . . That the early introduction of a presidency in the board of presbyters had its rise in the custom of the Synagogue, is the opinion of the learned M. Basnage. . . . Bishop Burnet acknowledges that even 'The order of the clergy does not appear from Scripture to be a positive institution, in any manner, as the sacraments were, . . . it does not appear that Christ gave any directions about that matter—the Apostles never represent it as being

of the essence of the visible Church of Christ, and besides it has been fully made out by the most learned writers, to be entirely taken from the model of the Jewish Synagogue, which, we are pretty sure, was not of Divine institution.'

"The primacy of rank, as in the case of the Jewish precedent, involved at first no supremacy over the other presbyters, nor did it denote any difference of office. . . . It is certain, that the bishop was not only chosen from the number of the presbyters, but for a long time, according to the testimony of Jerome, Eutychius and others, elected by them. The vestiges of this primitive right of election may be found within the Church of Rome itself, the Pope or supreme Bishop being still elected by the Cardinal Presbyters.* . . . The original reason for instituting this office of presidency, we are expressly told by some ancient writers, was to prevent schisms, and to remedy the inconveniences of opposition or division among presbyters whose preroga-

*"The presbyterial college or community in Alexandria, and its authority in the election of the Patriarch (which St. Jerome records), bears a singular resemblance to the Roman Cardinalate in its earlier form. See Tamagna, 'Origine e Prerogativi del Cardinali,' who quotes an important treatise on this subject by Mario Lupi, Arch-presbyter of Bergamo." Canon Jenkins on the Christ. Patriarchate, Cont. Rev. Novr., 1874, p. 849.

tives were equal. 'This difference between bishops and presbyters, says Dr. Whittaker (the learned defender of the Protestant cause), remarking upon St. Jerome's Confession that it was brought in as a remedy against schism, 'is a remedy almost worse than the disease, for it begat and brought in the Pope with his monarchy into the Church.'" Protestant Nonconformity, pp. 214–20.

ARGUMENT OF DR. JARED SPARKS.

Dr. Sparks, the editor of the Writings of Washington, while Pastor of the Independent Church of Baltimore, addressed a series of letters to Rev. Dr. Wyatt, from which we quote: "There is another consideration of some importance to me, and to all who do not agree with Episcopalians, on the subject of Church government. If you are right, we are all wrong. If, as you say, 'to the order of bishops alone belongs the power of ordaining ministers,' then no ministers out of the pale of the Episcopacy have ever been ordained. They have usurped an office, which did not belong to them; they have undertaken the discharge of duties, for which they were not qualified; they have been guilty of a rashness, which nothing but their obstinacy could account for, or their ignorance excuse. The positive ordinances of the

Church administered by them have been invalid, and unaccompanied by any of those good effects for which they were designed. . . . These, you will allow, are serious considerations, not only to ministers, but to the people of their charge, who if your statement be correct, are ignorantly entrusting their spiritual concerns to an unauthorized and unprofitable ministry.

"To support such claims, nothing could be considered sufficient but clear, continued unanswerable evidence. This evidence is not found in the Bible, or the practice of the primitive ages; it is not found in history, or the common sense of mankind, nor do I believe it can be found anywhere. . . .

"It can be indisputably proved from the Fathers, that the Churches in the primitive ages were not uniformly governed by three order of ministry, but frequently by two, and sometimes by one. *Secondly,* bishops were parochial clergymen, in many places at least, and nothing more. *Thirdly,* ordinations were performed by presbyters, especially in the case of Irenæus, and for a long time in the Church of Alexandria. *Fourthly,* no particular account can be given of the origin of the Church of Rome or of its first seven bishops.

"In regard to the testimony of the *later*

Fathers it should be remembered, when they speak of bishops, they do not mean the same kind of officers, as in modern times constitute the first order of Episcopacy.

"It is to be observed, that a bishop had no more than a parochial authority. The president of a single church was called a bishop, as well as the president of a larger number. These presidents, or bishops, were first chosen by the congregations at large, and ordained, or inducted into their offices, by the presbyters.

"Irenæus, whose testimony you bring in favor of Episcopacy, was ordained, according to Basnage, by presbyters only, even after the distinctions between bishops and presbyters began to exist; and this is allowed to have been the custom of the Church of Alexandria during the first three centuries. At length it became customary to invite neighboring bishops to aid in this ceremony; and thus, by degrees, arose the three orders in the ministry which was afterwards called an Episcopacy. . . .

"The Churches were not all uniform in their mode of government. Some Churches gave more authority to their bishops than others; and some retained their primitive usages longer than the others. Doddridge observes, that 'the power of the *bishops* seemed to have prevailed early in Rome; that of *presbytery* at Alexan-

dria; and at Carthage such a discipline as comes nearest to what is now called *Congregationalist*. The Churches at Alexandria gradually declined, and the Roman increased. The Church of England, and the Episcopal Church in this country, it seems, are a branch of this Roman Church." Sparks' Letters, pp. 9, 33, 46.

REV. GEO. S. MERRIAM.

In the New Englander, July, 1867, p. 478, this author says: "Jerome, at the end of the fourth century, the first scholar of his age, declares the original parity of the clergy, and supports this view by the striking case of the Church in Alexandria, where, down to the middle of the third century, the presbyters continued to choose and install their own bishops. Jerome's statement as to the Alexandrian custom is clear. Hilary gives the same view of the matter.

"Clearly these presbyters *made* one of their own number bishop—not merely nominating but installing him. If 'nominabant' meant only 'nominated,' the practice in the Church would have been the same as everywhere else. Jerome mentions it as an *exception*—the exception clearly being, that the authority of the bishop was conferred by the presbyters.

"The illustration in the case of an army and

of the choice of an archdeacon, clearly shows that this is meant—'just as if an army should make its general,' *i. e.*, choose and confer authority upon him.

"The historical evidence which has now been considered, shows that the office of bishop as distinct from that of presbyter, grew up after the Apostolic age. . . . Jerome gives a clear and well-sustained account of the *gradual* rise of the Episcopal order."

DR. EDWIN E. HALL.

In his lectures on the "Puritans and their Principles," in his examination of Jerome, and in reply to Chapin's Primitive Church, we read: "Let us sift this testimony. Jerome begins with saying: 'I hear that one was so impudent as to rank deacons before presbyters.' How does he prove that they are not so? By asserting the identity of presbyters with bishops: '*Now the Apostle plainly declares the same to be presbyters who are bishops*,' and he refers to the passages commonly cited, to show the absolute identity of the two. That is, deacons cannot be superior to presbyters, because presbyters are not only equal to bishops, but identical with them.

"This is the proof. Will Jerome stultify himself in pressing the proof further, by pro-

ceeding to show that presbyters are not equal to bishops? He certainly does not. He quotes one Caius to *substantiate*, not to *deny* what he has affirmed, viz.: that presbyters are by divine right, identical with bishops. What is the proof from Caius? why this: That in Alexandria, *the presbyters elected one of themselves* to hold a higher authority. They could not make him of a higher *order*. By divine right and appointment he was still a presbyter, though by the election of his brethren, he was made their *presiding officer or moderator:* 'Just,'—says Caius—'as deacons elect one from among themselves, and make him an archdeacon;' yet he is but a deacon in *order;* he holds no *divine order* above that of a simple deacon; but, in this respect, is a simple deacon still.

"What further proof from Caius? Why even at this day presbyters are so identical with bishops, that there is nothing that a bishop may do, which a presbyter may not, except ordination. Here is no *divine* right alleged, but for the sake of order, and by the election and appointment of his brethren, as Jerome has already affirmed,—he has at *this* day that preeminence assigned to him.

"What further proof? why this: that what this bishop, so elected at Alexandria, is, *that* all bishops are, whether at Rome, Eugubium,

or anywhere else; one is as much the successor of the Apostles as another; presbyters are, by divine right, everywhere equal to bishops. . . .

"But what concerning Aaron and his sons, and the Levites, as answering to bishop, priest and deacon? Does Jerome, after building his arguments entirely upon the identity of bishops and presbyters, now, at the very close of it, turn round and deny that same identity? By no means. The answer of Stillingfleet is conclusive on this point: 'For the comparison runs not between Aaron and his sons under the law, and bishops and presbyters under the Gospel; but between Aaron and his sons as one part of the comparison under the law, and the Levites under the other' (*i. e.*, not between high priests and priests, but combining both together as priests, and making Levites inferior). 'So under the Gospel, bishops and presbyters make one part of the comparison, answering to Aaron and his sons in that wherein all agree, viz.: the order of the priesthood, and the other part under the Gospel, answering to the Levites under the law.' (Irenicum, p. 293.)

"In an evil hour for Episcopacy, she fastened upon this passage to make Jerome contradict himself, by a seeming acknowledgment of a divine right of bishops above presbyters. His whole argument begins and ends with the

affirmation, and the *proof* that *bishops* and *presbyters*, are by divine appointment, *one and the same*. Instead of a contradiction, it is as strong a corroboration of Jerome's previous testimony as can well be given; that by divine appointment bishops and presbyters are the same; that in primitive times they were identical; that bishops grew up into a superior order little by little, from a human appointment as moderators; and that this both bishops and presbyters of the day know to the true." In support of the statement of Jerome that the institution of bishops was a human office and not a divine order, Dr. Hall quotes the noted statement of Stillingfleet. (Irenicum, p. 301.)

"For as to the matter itself I believe upon the strictest inquiry Medina's judgment will prove true; that Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theoderet, Theophylact, were all of Aerius's judgment as to the *identity of both the names* and ORDER OF BISHOPS and *Presbyters*."—*Puritans, &c.*, p. 347–9.

REV. DR. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK.

"On the Origin and Growth of Episcopacy," in the Am. Pres. and Theo. Rev., Jan. 1867, p. 154, this able divine states: "As the Apostles, most of them went eastward, it is easy to understand why Episcopacy should develop more

rapidly in the Orient than in the Occident. . . . . He then quotes Hilary: "Even Timothy, who was made Presbyter by Paul himself, is called Bishop; because *the presbyters oldest in office* were called bishops, so that when one passed away the next in order might take his place. And then in Egypt presbyters administer confirmation, if no bishop be present. But because presbyters *in the succession*, began to be found unworthy of holding the first places, *the method was changed*, the Council providing that *not rank but merit*, should make the Bishop, many priests uniting in the appointment, lest some unworthy person should assume the office, and many be scandalized." . . . . That is to say, Episcopal vacancies began to be filled, not by succession, but by election. . . . . Such appears to be the testimony of a Roman Deacon, who was also a clear-headed and able writer near the fourth century.

"Jerome (born at Stridon in Dalmatia about 340, died at Bethlehem, 420 A. D.) makes similar statements. In his Epistle *Ad Evangelum* (146th), written for the express purpose of pointing out the difference between bishop, presbyter and deacon, he undertakes first of all to show, that in the New Testament, bishop and presbyter are the same, quoting the very passages usually quoted in our day to wit, etc., ...

and then adds: 'That one was afterwards *elected* to be set over the rest was for the healing of schisms, lest one drawing himself a party should rend the Church of Christ.

"At Alexandria, the mode of appointing bishops had prevailed, he says, from the time of Mark the Evangelist down to Heraclas (who died in 248), and Dionysius (who died in 265 A. D.).

"The exact date of this change of method, spoken of by Hilary, cannot be given. But what Jerome says of the reason for this change, enables us to fix, with tolerable certainty, upon the second century, during which the Church was greatly disturbed by heresies, which threatened to result in schisms, and perhaps we might say the early part of the second century. In the midst of this pressure and peril, the Church, instead of taking for her bishops the men who chanced to stand first on her roll of presbyters, had need of her ablest men, and therefore the episcopate was made elective, the presbyters choosing one of their own number to this higher office. This was the first stage in the development.

"The next stage was reached when the bishop, instead of being elected within the presbytery, was voted for also by the people." He gives the cases of Fabianus and Cornelius and

Cyprian, who "was carried into office by popular suffrage over the heads, and in spite of the opposition of a majority of the Carthagenian presbyters.

"When this point had been reached, the bishop began rapidly to concentrate all ecclesiastical power into his own hands."

DR. GEORGE P. FISHER.

One of the ablest writers on Church History, Prof. Fisher, of Yale Seminary, thus presents the origin of the Episcopate in his "Beginnings of Christianity," p. 551: "Respecting the rise of the Episcopate, there is, at the present day, a near approach to a *consensus* among scholars in the various Protestant Churches. A thoroughly learned and candid discussion of the whole subject is presented in Prof. J. B. Lightfoot's Excursus on the "Christian Ministry," appended to his Commentary on the Philippians."

"Within the covers of the New Testament, the terms presbyter and bishop are synonymous. . . . The original parity of the ministry gave way to the early Episcopate, which spread rapidly, and became universal in the first half of the second century. Ignatius of Antioch is the first writer who brings to light this change in ecclesiastical arrangements (we assume, as

the more probable opinion, the genuineness of the seven Greek Epistles in the shorter form). In the Churches of Asia Minor when he wrote, A. D. 107 or 108, the bishop was above the presbyters; although it would be rash to affirm that the extravagant homage which this author is anxious to secure for bishops, was shared by any of his contemporaries. On the contrary, when Clement of Rome, at a somewhat earlier date (A. D. 96 or 97), wrote his Epistles to the Church of Corinth, the equality of the presbyters there still continued.

Then referring to Polycarp, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus and others, he continues: "Their language is not without traces of that primitive identity of the two offices, which is distinctly asserted by Jerome, and before him by Hilary Ambrosiaster, and which the Apostolic writings exhibit. . . . The sacerdotal conception of the ministry is not found in Ignatius, in Clement of Rome, or Clement of Alexandria, in Justin, or in Irenæus, or in any other ecclesiastical writer prior to Tertullian. . . . The notion that a priestly unction and a mediatorial office, analogous to the hierarchy of the old covenant belonged to the Christian ministry, is equally foreign to the Fathers of the first age, and to the writers of the New Testament. . . .

"Gradually in the Church, ordination came to be the peculiar prerogative of the bishop; but as late as the Council of Ancyra (A. D. 314), we find by the 13th Canon, that presbyters, with the bishop's consent, may still ordain. In the great Church of Alexandria, as we are told by Jerome, down to the middle of the third century, a vacancy in the episcopal office was filled by the twelve presbyters from their own number, who, it would appear, if he received any new consecration, themselves advanced him to the higher office; as, indeed, Hilary Ambrosiaster, and Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria in the ninth century, expressly state." Compare Lightfoot, p, 249, and Giesler, I., p. 140, N. 2.

TESTIMONY OF DR. THOMAS SMYTH.

No author has written with more ability on Church government than this learned divine. He writes: "The Churches in Egypt and Africa held, as we have seen, to presbyterial ordination. This is further evident from the case of the Church of Alexandria. After the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, A. D. 231, the bishops or presidents of this Church appear to have been prelatically ordained. But, however this may be, previous to that time, even from the days of Mark, the presbyters elected one of their number, and set him apart as their presi-

dent. This fact, which certifies the custom of one of the most prominent Churches during the three first centuries, we will have occasion fully to substantiate."

"The Church (Alexandria) was one of the most important in ecclesiastical antiquity. It was the seat of the most celebrated of all the Christian colleges or theological seminaries, which was renowned for its doctors and illustrious for its literature. Pantænus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen were its three first professors. The Church, therefore, was a city set on a hill, and gave example and precept to all others."

Then quoting Jerome, he proceeds: "It is, however, attempted to obviate the force of this testimony, by alleging that Jerome only attributes to the presbyters the right of *election*, while the bishops they elected were ordained by some other bishops." This however is a vain refuge, and can afford no help. See this fully and admirably shown by Baxter in his Disput. on Ch. Govt., pp. 216–18. Jerome is not alone in testifying to the presbyterianism of Alexandria. Eutychius, who was afterwards bishop of this Church, bears the same testimony.

The learned Renaudot, in attempting to show that this passage refers only to election, and not to ordination, is compelled, however, to contra-

dict himself, and, like the high priest, to bear witness for the truth. For, while he insists that the word here means holding up their hands, as in elections, and not laying on hands in ordination, yet, afterwards stumbling upon a passage from Severus, where the former translation suited his views, it was so evidently the sense of the passage that he could not otherwise translate it, he blames Ecchelensis and Morinus for translating it in the latter way, and affirms it to mean ordination by laying on of hands. This, surely, betrays rather a bad cause; and in fact, the meaning of the passage does not alone depend upon that one word, the word *created* being still more decisive. Renaudot further admits, that George Elmacinus, in the first part of his annals, gives the same account of the matter as Eutychius."

Then quoting Severus, and other Fathers (see above p. 21), he proceeds: "And that this practice—the election and consecration, as far as any form of induction was used, of their bishop by the presbyters—was not pecular to Alexandria, but was common even in Rome, is proved by Eusebius, who relates (vi. 29), that in the appointment of Fabianus to the bishopric of Rome, the assembly that met to elect a bishop, having fixed upon him, *placed him at once on the episcopal throne*, 'which seems to me,' says Mr.

Goode, very candidly, 'irreconcilable with the notion of the essential necessity of episcopal consecration, to have entitled him to the episcopal seat, for he was installed in it without any such consecration.'"

"Now it is thus proved, by numerous witnesses, and admitted by many prelatists, that the presbyters of Alexandria made their own bishops, by electing one of their number to act as president, and that this practice had continued since the days of Mark, that is about thirty-five years before the death of John, A. D. 63.

"It may seem probable from Jerome," says Burnet (Obs. on the 1st Canon, p. 8), "that presbyters chose their own bishop out of their own number, and that, in Alexandria, they made him bishop without any new ordination." Smyth also refers to Thorndike's Prim. Govt. of the Ch., p. 58; Nolan's Cath. Ch. of Christ, p. 19; Natalus Alex. Eccles. Diss., pp. 123–4.

DR. SAMUEL MILLER.

This erudite Professor of Church History in the Princeton Seminary, on this subject, remarks: "It appears from Jerome, that the first approach towards Prelacy was the standing *moderatorship* of one of the presbyters; that this began in the Church of Alexandria very early; soon, if not immediately after the days

of Mark the Evangelist; and that this was the only kind of clerical imparity that existed up to the middle of the third century, when it gave place to some higher encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition." Letters on Christ. Ministry, pt. ii. p. 214. In pt. i. p. 187, he answers the common objections.

DR. TIMOTHY DWIGHT.

In his Discourse on "Officers of the Church," Works, iv., 238, Dr. Dwight writes: "I have mentioned every passage in Scripture, which I remember, where bishops are even glanced at, or the existence of such an order of ministers, as distinguished from elders, is directly countenanced, even in the opinion of its advocates. If the distinction between bishops and elders can be found in the language of Scripture, it is found here. But here no distinction of this nature can be found.

"Accordingly, a multitude of Episcopalians, both bishops and others readily acknowledge, that this distinction is not capable of proof from the Scriptures. The following specimens of this acknowledgment will suffice for the present purpose. In a celebrated work, called 'The Institution of a Christian Man,' approved expressly by Archbishop Cranmer and the main body of the English clergy, together with the

King and Parliament, is this declaration: 'In the New Testament there is no mention of any other degrees, but of deacons or ministers, or of presbyters or bishops.'" In support of this position he quotes Stillingfleet, Rainolds, Holland, Burnet and others.

He says: "The testimony of the Fathers does not prove the distinction contended for," and refers to Ignatius, Clement, Polycarp, Tertullian, Irenæus, Firmilian, Hilary and Theodoret.

"Jerome says, that 'A presbyter is the same as a bishop and that originally the Churches were governed by the joint council of the presbyters.' Again; 'Let the bishops know that they are greater than presbyters rather by custom, than by the real appointment of the Lord.' And again: 'Among the ancients, presbyters and bishops were the same, and finally: 'The presbyters of *Alexandria* ordained their bishops, for more than two hundred years from the first planting of their Church.'"

DR. JOHN M. MASON.

This pre-eminent divine has given a thorough investigation of the position of Jerome in his Essays of Episcopacy, Works iii. This work was republished in 1844, as an antidote to the "Apology for Apostolic Order, and its Advo-

cates," the work of Bishop Hobart, and originally addressed in a series of letters to Dr. Mason. The contest between these prominent theologians was originally started, by the language of Bishop H. in his "Companion to the Altar," p. 202: "Where the Gospel is proclaimed, communion with the Church by the participation of its ordinances, at the hands of the duly authorized priesthood is the indispensable condition of salvation." This was followed by another volume by the same author, entitled "A Companion to the Festivals and Fasts," in which, p. 59, was written: "Whoever is in communion with the bishop, the supreme governor of the Church upon earth, is in communion with the head of it; and whoever is not in communion with the bishop, is thereby cut off from communion with Christ." . . . "a general conclusion," "established by the uniform testimony of all the apostolic and primitive writers."

It was these statements that called out the reply of Dr. Mason, from which we give an extract. It is remarkable, in view of what has occurred, to read in the introduction to the Essays, these words: "If it does succeed, it will be a sad success over freedom of conscience and intelligent piety; it will be a success in riveting more strongly spiritual domination, in

substituting *modes* and the *opus operatum* for the fruits of the Spirit; and in ultimately driving out from its fellowship, some who from preference, choice and even conviction, would rather remain (as a salt indeed) within its communion."

In the republication of the Essays, p. 234, we read: "Jerome states it as a *historical fact*, that the first bishops were made by *presbyters themselves;* and consequently they could neither have, nor communicate any authority above that of presbyters. "*Afterwards*," says he, "to prevent schism one was *elected* to preside over the rest." Elected and commissioned by whom? By the presbyters; for he immediately gives you a broad fact which it is impossible to explain away. At "Alexandria," he writes, "from the Evangelist Mark to the Bishops Heraclas and Dionysius," *i. e.*, till about the middle of the third century, "the presbyters *always chose* one of their number, placed him in a superior station, and called him bishop."

"We have not forgotten the gloss put upon this passage, by *Detector* (Bp. Hobart) in the collection under review: 'The truth is,' says he, 'that Jerome offers no authority for this assertion.' In his epistle to Evag, he says, 'Nam et Alexandriæ, a Marco Evangelista us que ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos,

Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in exselsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant; quomodo si exercitus Imperatorum faciat, aut diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent." Does St. Jerome here declare, as the fictitious 'Clemens' asserts, that the presbyters *ordained* their bishops?' no; Jerome merely asserts, that the presbyters *named*, *chose* one to be their bishop. Does it hence follow, that they *gave him their commission;* that they *ordained* him? Does it *always* follow, that because an army choose their general, he does not receive his commission from the supreme authority of the State?'

"With all deference to this learned critic, we cannot help our opinion, that the appointment, or, if you please, ordination, of the first bishops by presbyters, not only *follows*, from the words of Jerome, but is plainly *asserted* by them."

Dr. Hobart, overlooking the Roman idiom, has thrown into his *English* an ambiguity which does not exist in the *Latin* of Jerome. According to the well-known genius of that language, especially in writers who condense their thoughts, a verb governing one or more participles, in the construction before us, expresses the same meaning, though with greater elegance, as would be expressed by verbs instead of participles. It is very possible that the *Detector*

does not use this construction; but the *Detector* does not write Latin like old Jerome. We should display the sentence at length, converting the participles into verbs, were it not for fear of affronting a scholar who insists that he has 'sufficient learning to defend the Episcopal Church.'

(Dr. M. gives an illustration, from Cesar's first sentence in the building of his bridge. De Bel. Gal. L. iv. c. 17.)

"The truth is, that this 'famous' testimony of Jerome, points out, in the process of bishop-making, but *one agency*, and that is the agency of *presbyters*. Dr. H. himself has unwittingly confirmed our interpretation in the very paragraph where he questions it. His words are these: 'Jerome merely asserts that the presbyters *named*, *chose* one to be their bishop.' Not *merely* this: for the words which Dr. H. renders 'being placed in a higher station' are under the very same connection and government with the words which he renders, 'being chosen from among themselves;' and if, as he has admitted, the latter declare a bishop to have been *elected* by the presbyters, then, himself being judge, the former must declare him to have been *commissioned* by them. This is an awkward instance and *felo de se;* yet a proof, how properly the Reverend critic has assumed the appellation

of *Detector;* for he has completely *detected* himself, and no one else.

"That we rightly construe Jerome's assertion is clear from the scope of his argument, and from his phraseology toward the close of the paragraph.

"His position is, that a bishop and a presbyter were at first the same officers. And so notorious was the fact that he appeals to the history of the Church in Alexandria, as an instance which lasted a century and a half, that when bishops were made, they were made by presbyters. But had Dr. H.'s construction been right, had prelates alone ordained other prelates, the fact, instead of being *for* Jerome would have been directly *against* him; and surely he was not so dull as to have overlooked this circumstance; though it seems to have escapted the notice of some of his sagacious commentators.

"Jerome says, moreover, that presbyters originally became bishops, much in the same way as if an army should '*make* an Emperor,' or the deacons should elect one of themselves and call him *archdeacon*.

"The *Detector* has given the passage a *twist* in the hope of *twisting* Jerome out, and twisting the hierarchy in. 'Does it *always* follow' he demands, 'that because an army choose

their general, he does not receive his commission from the supreme authority of the State?' Certainly not. Although he would have gratified some of his readers by producing examples of the armies of those ages choosing their general and remitting him to a higher authority for his commission. But how came the *Detector* to alter Jerome's phrase, '*making*' to '*choosing*.' We always thought that *making* and *commissioning* an officer were one and the same thing.

"Further, how came the Detector to render Jerome's '*imperator*' by 'general?' *Almost* all the world (for the Detector seems to be an exception), knows that 'imperator,' in Jerome's day, signified not 'general,' but 'Emperor;' and was the highest official title of the Roman Monarchs. It is further known, that the army had on more occasions than one, *made* an Emperor, and that this was all the commission he had." (See the instance of Julian in Gibbon.)

We have but space for one more extract from the argument of this acute controversialist, which includes thirty pages.

"Whatever Eusebius, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, may write in *favor* of episcopacy, must be received with this very important qualification, that they *themselves were bishops;* and were

testifying in favor of their *own* titles, emolument, grandeur and power.

"They had a very deep interest at stake. An interest sufficient, if not to stake their credibility on this point, yet greatly to reduce its value. On the contrary, Jerome had nothing to gain, but much to lose. He put his interest and peace in jeopardy. He had to encounter the hostility of the episcopal order, and of all who aspired to its honors. He had to resist the growing encroachment and corruption, and that under the formidable protection of a civil establishment. He had, therefore, every possible inducement to be *sure of his facts* before he attacked a set of dignitaries who were not, in his age, the most forbearing of mankind.

"The conclusion is, that Jerome, as we have said, is a more unexceptionable witness than any prelate. . . . . Their silence under his challenges is more than a presumption that they found it wise to let him alone. . . . . Jerome, with the register of antiquity in his hand, and the train of presbyters at his back, was too potent an adversary."

DR. HENRY A. BOARDMAN.

From the work of this author on the "High Church Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession,"

we make the following extract on the point under discussion.

"The Christian Fathers are entitled to the same respect as men of equal piety and intelligence in other ages of the Church, but the exorbitant veneration entertained for them by Romanists and High Churchmen, has been a source of incalculable mischief to the Church. . . . . The assurance, however, with which Prelatists are in the habit of asserting that the testimony of the Primitive Church is entirely in their favor, makes it proper to divert on this point for a little, before proceeding with the argument.

"I shall show in another connection, that it was the common judgment of the Reformers and the Reformed Churches, that bishops and presbyters are by divine institution *one order*, and that the existing arrangement in Prelatical Churches by which the powers of jurisdiction and ordination have been taken from presbyters, and given exclusively to the bishops, is a matter of mere human arrangement.

"For the present, I content myself with citing the testimony of a single witness from antiquity in proof of these points. This witness is the celebrated Jerome, who flourished about the year four hundred, and of whom Erasmus declared, that 'he was without con-

troversy, the most learned of all Christians, the prince of divines, and that for eloquence he excelled Cicero.' The extracts that follow will furnish an adequate answer to the questions so often asked, about the time and manner of the rise of Prelacy. I give them from Dr. Mason's translation."

Examining Jerome, and employing the line of argument of Dr. Mason; after referring to the Church of Alexandria; he concludes: "Finally, Jerome states that *even in his time*, *i. e.*, towards the end of the fourth century, there was no power excepting ordination, exercised by a bishop which might not be exercised by a presbyter. 'What does a bishop,' he asks, 'excepting ordination, which a presbyter may not do?' Notwithstanding the innovations he describes, had already been made, and episcopacy introduced (as a remedy for schism!) yet even in his time the new order of things was not wholly established. *Ordination* had been given up to the bishops, but the presbyters had not surrendered entirely the right of *jurisdiction*, nor indeed any other right. They afterwards lost even this measure of independence. They were obliged to succumb to the bishops, as the bishops, in turn, were to the metropolitans and patriarchs, and these, at last, to the Pope."

After an exhaustive examination of the sub-

ject, he proceeds: "These extracts show that it is the common judgment of REFORMED CHRISTENDOM, a party in the Church of England, and in the Episcopal Church in this country excepted, that bishops and presbyters are, according to the Word of God, *of one order*, and that PRESBYTERS, equally with bishops, have a RIGHT TO ORDAIN.

"It detracts nothing from the force of this conclusion, that the Churches just named, practically deny the validity of Presbyterial ordination. We quote the Church of England, both as to theory and practice, *against itself*, and leave it to its friends to harmonize its inconsistencies. As regards its refusal to recognize any except Prelatical ordinations, it is to be regretted that that Church, and its daughter this side of the Atlantic, should have suffered the High Churchism, which was so heartily repudiated by its founders, to place them in a position which has so offensive and *Popish* an aspect towards other evangelical Churches, because this cannot but have an injurious effect upon the general interests of Christianity.

"But if they choose to give themselves up to the sway of this spirit—if their bishops should even take Laud himself, the all but canonized 'confessor and martyr,' of the Oxford coterie, for their model, as indeed some

of them seem quite willing to do—it could not cancel their past testimony to the great scriptural truth, that presbyters and bishops are *identical in ordor*, and are, so far as the divine institution of the office is concerned, *clothed with the same powers.*"

Chrysostom, a contemporary of Jerome, in speaking of the difference between presbyters and bishops, uses language which implies that presbyters had lost their former right of ordination, and that they were somehow unfairly deprived of it. He says: "There is no great difference between a bishop and a presbyter. . . . In the ordination only, have they gone above, and in that thing only seem to take advantage of (*pleonectein*), the presbyters." The word *pleonectein*, in New Testament Greek means to defraud, to circumvent—see 2 Cor. ii. 11; xii. 17, 18; 1 Thess. iv. 6. Harrison, "Church of the Fathers," p. 263–4, has shown that Chrysostom, in his Commentary, gives the word this meaning on the above texts.

We have thus far presented this additional testimony from the brightest Lights in the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches; and all American but two; to further emphasize the fact, that the custom of election and ordination of bishops by presby-

ters, which prevailed in the Patriarchal Church in Alexandria for two centuries, is thoroughly understood in those Churches, so largely predominant in this land; and that all hope of leading their ministers and members to embrace the views of the comparatively diminutive number of Protestant Christians, who hold to a divine order of bishops in Apostolic succession; possessing the sole, exclusive power of imparting a right to preach and administer sacraments, by the laying on of their hands in ordination; is utterly futile, and that these claims, so openly and persistently made, are necessarily becoming more and more offensive, as their unreasonableness and unsoundness are becoming more apparent.

As this class of people rely so largely on the effect of Episcopal ordination, we shall offer additional decisive testimony, from the writings of divines of the highest rank as scholars, on whom Episcopal hands have been laid; who defend Episcopacy on the ground of its Original institution, as a human and desirable arrangement, when regarded in its true light as an *Office;* but necessarily injurious when wrongly held to be an ORDER, and that divinely diverse from that of Presbyter.

ADDITIONAL CONFIRMATORY TESTIMONY FROM CHURCH OF ENGLAND DIVINES.

To the decisive testimony already presented by English Episcopal Divines, Willet, Ussher, Stillingfleet, Stanley, Litton, Goode and Riddle, as to the historical fact concerning the Church of Alexandria, we now offer additional evidence in the same line, by other equally eminent Theologians of the same Communion.

REV. DR. G. A. JACOB.

This writer, whose work on "Ecclesiastical Polity" has been widely adopted as a Text Book, says: "The episcopate in the modern acceptation of the term, and as a distinct clerical order, does not appear in the New Testament, but was gradually introduced and extended throughout the Church at a later period." After examining the patristic evidence on the subject, he continues: "The origin of Episcopacy is expressly acknowledged by patristic testimony even in the fourth century, when there was so strong a tendency to magnify the bishop's office. It is acknowledged that churches were at first governed by the common advice of presbyters; that schisms and contentions among them made it necessary to place one over the others, and that the custom of the

Church, rather than any ordinance of the Lord, made bishops greater than the rest. Let Jerome's unmistakable words be a sufficient evidence of this: 'Idem est ergo Presbyter qui Episcopus,' etc. . . . The episcopal office in its original institution was one of simple piority among the other ministers, rather than a superior order in the Church. . . . A very interesting account of the successive advances . . . made in the second and third centuries is given by Prof. Lightfoot in his treatise on the Christian Ministry, appended to his edition of the Epistle to the Philippians. He there points out that the development of the episcopal authority was marked by three distinct stages of progress, which were connected respectively with the names of Ignatius, Irenæus, and Cyprian. In the time of Ignatius, the bishop then only *primus inter pares* among his co-presbyters, was regarded as a *centre of unity;* in the time of Irenæus, he was looked upon as the *depository of Scriptural truth;* and with Cyprian the bishop was the *absolute vicegerent of Christ* in things spiritual in the Church." Dr. J. speaks of "the tendency to thrust the Church usages of later times upon the apostolic age, without regard to the facts in the case."

"Jerome expressly affirms that it was ecclesiastical custom, and the desire to prevent dis-

putes, and not any divine law that caused the distinction between bishops and presbyters. This distinction according to him, consisting principally, if not solely, in the authority to ordain. Long after the general establishment of Episcopacy, and reaching even to the fourth century, traces are to be found of presbyterian ordinations still retaining their place in the Christian Church.

"Prof. Lightfoot quotes a decree of the Council of Ancyra (A. D. 314), to the effect that neither the country bishops nor the *city presbyters* were to give ordinations without permission from the bishop of the diosese in writing. . . . 'It is especially important to observe that they lay more stress on episcopal *sanction* than on Episcopal *ordination*.'"

"Another remarkable testimony to the existence and long continuance of presbyterian ordination is given by Eutychius, a Patriarch of Alexandria." Then quoting Eutychius, he adds: "This distinct testimony of Eutychius is confirmed by Jerome, who lived so close to the time when the Alexandrian practice was still in force." Eccle. Pol. pp. 67, 80, 112.

DR. LIGHTFOOT, BISHOP OF DURHAM.

This eminent scholar, recently deceased, referred to by Dr. Jacob, is styled by Bishop Browne, of Ely, as "one of the ablest, most learned, and most candid of living divines." In his Commentary of Phillipians, p. 96, he writes: "Of the identity of the 'bishop' and 'presbyter' in the language of the apostolic age, the following evidence seems conclusive." Presenting the ordinary proof texts he proceeds: "Nor is it only in the apostolic writings that this identity is found. St. Clement wrote probably in the last decade of the first century, and in his language the terms are convertible.

"Towards the close of the second century the original application of the term 'bishop' seems to have passed not only out of use, but almost out of memory. . . . In the fourth century when the fathers of the Church began to examine the apostolic records with a more critical eye, they at once detected the fact. . . . Of his predecessors the Ambrosial Hilary had discerned the same truth. Of his contemporaries and successors, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theoderet, all acknowlege it. Thus in every one of the extant Commentaries on the epistles containing the crucial passages, whether Greek or Latin,

before the close of the fifth century, this identity is affirmed, 'p. 230.' Even in the fourth and fifth century when the independence and power of the episcopate had reached its maximum, it was still customary for a bishop in writing to a presbyter to address him as 'fellow presbyter,' thus bearing testimony to a substantial identity of order. Nor does it appear that this view was ever questioned until the Reformation."

After quoting Jerome, Hilary and Augustine, and referring to Cyprian, and to references presented by Giesler, he proceeds: "The case of the Alexandrian Church, which has already been presented casually, deserves special notice. St. Jerome, after denouncing the audacity of certain persons, who would give to deacons the precedence over presbyters, that is over bishops," and alleging Scriptural proofs of the identity of the two, gives the following fact in illustration: "At Alexandria, etc." After quoting Jerome he writes: "Though the direct statement of this father refers only to the *appointment* of the bishop, still it may be inferred that the function of the presbyters extended also to the *consecration*. And this inference is borne out by other evidence. 'In Egypt,' writes an older contemporary of St. Jerome, the commentator Hilary, the presbyters seal (*i. e.* ordain or consecrate), if the bishop be

not present. This, however, might refer only to the ordination of presbyters, and not to the consecration of a bishop. But even the latter is supported by direct evidence, which though comparatively late deserves consideration, inasmuch as it comes from one who was himself a patriarch of Alexandria. Eutychius, who held the patriarchal See from A. D. 933 to A. D. 940, writes as follows: 'The Evangelist Mark, etc.' . . . It is clear from this passage that Eutychius considered the functions of nomination and ordination to rest with the same persons."

"At the close of the second century, when every considerable Church in Europe appears to have had its bishop, the only representative of the episcopal order in Egypt was the bishop of Alexandria. . . . It was a matter of convenience and almost of necessity that the Alexandrian presbyters should themselves ordain their chief."

Bishop Lightfoot proceeds to show how the views of the episcopate in regard to power, changed gradually, and decidedly in the periods represented by Ignatius, Irenæus, and Cyprian; as we have seen referred to by Dr. Jacob. Then discussing the claim of Sacerdotalism; by reference to Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Irenæus, and Clement of

Alexandria, he proves that these fathers attached no such office to the Christian ministry; but that "Tertullian is the first to assert direct sacerdotal claims on behalf of the Christian ministry." "The march of sacerdotal ideas was probably slower at Alexandria than at Carthage or Rome." The reason is clear, the office of the bishop was not unscriptually and unreasonably magnified.

DR. EDWIN HATCH.

Few works in this age have produced a deeper impression than "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," by the Bampton Lectures for 1880. The work was soon translated into German. The Brit. Quar., January, 1883, p. 127, says of it: "What Niebuhr did for Roman, and Grote for Grecian history, Hallam, Stubbs and Freeman have done for English history. Mr. Hatch has done the same for Church history, and with a boldness and noble fidelity to truth, so far as it can be ascertained, which refuses to be biased by either Church traditions, or party interests . . . Its patient investigations and conclusions distinctly mark an epoch in the history of ecclesiastical traditions."

Principal Fairbairn thus writes of this work: "We cannot but admire its fine analytical

qualities, its delicate appreciation of the forces at work, and the true sense for history and historical movement that pervades it. The book is a healthy one, and will help to set the question it discusses in a fresh light before the Anglican, as distinguished from the English student. . . . English scholarships, broadened and illumined by German, is becoming too critical in spirit and historical in method, to spare the old high Anglican doctrines. The Divine right of Episcopacy is dead; it died of the light created by historical criticism. It is open to no manner of doubt that the modern bishop has no place in the New Testament."

This powerful writer (Dr. Fairbairn), has so clearly shown how the Sacerdotal system grew out of the perversion of the Primitive Episcopate, that we quote him:

"A priestless was too pure a religion; men were not yet spiritual enough for it. The sacerdotal was everywhere esteemed the sacred; what was not sensuously holy was not holy at all. Jew and Greek alike knew the priest, neither knew any religion without him, and to bring down Christ to their level was easier than to rise to His. It was more familiar and natural, more in harmony with universal and immemorial custom to speak of the person active in things religious as a priest, than as an elder, or

teacher, or preacher. And the more important and authoritative the bishop became, the stronger grew the tendency to invest him with sacerdotal functions.

"The inevitable result begins to appear in Tertullian. The bishop becomes to him *sacerdos*. The presbyters, indeed, form an *ordo sacerdotalis*, and the bishop is *sunmus sacerdos*, and *pontifex maximus*. Hypolytus denotes the office by the terms *archieratia to kai didaskalia*. Cyprian, of course, goes further, and his bishop is uniformly *sacerdos*, his associates *consacerdotes*, and the presbyters are *cum episcopo sacerdotali honore conjuncti*.

"In the Apostolic Constitutions the bishop is frequently designated *iereus*, and once, indeed, *archiereus*. These terms show the work of deprivation complete: the priestless religion made thoroughly priestly; Christianity transformed into a hierarchic and sacerdotal system, ceased to be the religion of Christ. All that He had most hated in Judaism, entered and took possession of the faith that called itself by His name. His Church ceased to be a society of the like-minded, where the freedom of the spirit reigned; became a stupendous sacerdotal *civitas* or state, where the ecclesiastic was supreme, and obedience was conformity to his institutions." Brit. Quar., Oct., 1881, 210.

A few extracts from Dr. Hatch's work will be given to show the drift of a volume which will amply repay critical study. On p. 83, he writes: "I approach this question with the greater diffidence because an hypothesis has long been current which does not admit of direct refutation, and which assigns the origin of this quasi monarchical government to an institution of either our Lord Himself, or the Apostles acting under His express directions. But in spite of the venerable names by which for many centuries, and in many Churches this hypothesis has been maintained, and in spite also of the disadvantage under which any one labors who declines the short and easy road which it seems to offer, and winds his way through a dense undergrowth of intricate facts, it is impossible, at least for some of us, to accept the belief that the episcopate forms an exception to the general course of the divine government of the world, and to refrain from proceeding to the inquiry whether any causes are in operation which are adequate to account for its supremacy, without resorting to the hypothesis of a special and extraordinary institution.

P. 98: "The episcopate grew by the force of circumstances, in the order of Providence, to satisfy a felt need. It is pertinent to add that this view as to the chief cause which oper-

ated to produce it has not the merit or demerit of novelty. Although the view must rest on its own inherent probability as a complete explanation of the known facts of the case, it has the support of the earliest and greatest of ecclesiastical antiquaries. St. Jerome, arguing against the growing tendency to exalt the diaconate at the expense of the presbyterate, maintains that the Churches were originally governed by a plurality of presbyters, but that in course of time one was elected to preside over the rest as a remedy against division, lest different presbyters, having different views of doctrine, should, by each of them drawing a portion of the community to himself, cause divisions in it. The supremacy of a single officer which was thus forced upon the Churches by the necessity of unity of doctrine, was consolidated by the necessity of unity in discipline."

P. 105. "The view that bishops, and not presbyters, are the successors of the Apostles, appears first by implication in the claims of Zephyrinus and Calistus, during the Montanist controversy, to have the power of absolving penitents from sin, which appears to have been based on the assumption of their succession from St. Peter. (Tertullian de Pudic. 21, &c.)"

P. 107: "The Church writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, Chrysostom, Epiphanius,

Jerome, Hilary the deacon, expressly state that bishops and presbyters are equal, save in the one respect, that the former only have the right of appointing persons to Church office. It is maintainable upon the evidence that, even in this one respect, the writers in question wrote only of the usage of their own times, and that in earlier times the interposition of a bishop was not always required. What the bishop was conceived of having, was not peculiarity of function, but priority of rank." The cases of the ordination of Daniel the monk, by Paphnutius a presbyter, and earlier, that of Felicissimus by Novatus another presbyter, whose validity Cyprian does not question, are presented.

P. 130: "The conception of ordination, so far as we can gather either from the words which were used to designate it, or from the elements which entered into it, was that simply of appointment and admission to office.

"But there is one element, which was not present in admissions to civil office, and to which in later times great importance has been attached—the rite of the imposition of hands." After showing that in the form of ordination of a bishop in the Apostolic Constitutions, no mention was made of imposition of hands, he proceeds: "In entire harmony with this is the account which Jerome gives of the admission

to office of the bishop of Alexandria: after the election, the presbyters conduct the elected bishop to the chair: he is thereupon bishop *de facto*." He quotes from Jerome; refers to Eutychius, "as a later, but apparently independent authority, to the same effect;" mentions Flaccus Albinus as adopting Jerome's account, which is also corroborated by the language of Synesius.

"It follows from this that the rite was not universal: it is impossible that if it were not universal, it can have been regarded as essential." . . .

It appears that Gore, whom we have already quoted, attempted a reply to Hatch's Book. We have not seen it. The Brit. Quar. Review, Jany., 1883, remarks of it: "Mr. Hatch scarcely needed to have devoted the pages of his preface to this edition to reply to the pamphlet of Mr. Gore, which is much stronger in vehement language than in evidence and argument.

"Mr. Hatch's work has well nigh paralyzed the advocates of the ecclesiastical traditions which it traverses. No competent ecclesiastical historian has attempted a refutation of it."

REV. THOMAS WYMBERLY MOSSMAN.

Among the most thorough, original and satisfactory examinations of the organization of the Primitive Church of the first two centuries, is that of the author above named, Rector of Torrington. Like most Episcopal divines, in his early ministry, he held to three *orders* in the ministry: to a second ordination, and to the episcopal succession. He was led to an understanding of the facts in the case, by a careful study of all primitive documents in the original. The results are seen in his "History of the Early Christian Church," too little known in this country. This author was compelled by the light he received, to abandon all these positions. In Preface, p. xiv., he writes: "It has been too hastily assumed that Protestants, and Non-Conformists, as they are called, would not have had standing ground in the Primitive Church. I thought so once. Deeper reading, and reflection, have convinced me of the contrary." "A student of the Fathers I had been all my life, but had always read them with a ready-made apparatus of Anglican views and theories at hand to interpret them, until, a few years ago, I resolved to review the whole of Ante-Nicene literature, divesting myself, as far

as I could, of all preconceived opinions. This history is the result of that review."

With regard to this subject, Mossman says: "The original Constitution of the Church of Alexandria, it is scarcely too much to say, is the most important question of Ante-Nicene Christianity."

"In order to arrive at the truth about the constitution of the Alexandrian Church we must collect and compare together all the statements which can be found in ancient writers bearing upon the question; and although the impartial reader must judge for himself, we shall be mistaken, indeed, if the evidence to show that that community was, originally, not what is now called an episcopal one, be not felt to be, taken as a whole, simply overwhelming."

On p. 94, our author, quoting the language of Eutychius, remarks: "By making or constituting bishops where none had been before, it is probably meant that Demetrius and Hieraclas appointed in some of the principal cities of Egypt one presbyter to preside permanently over his brethren, in the same way that they did themselves in the metropolis; and as all the presbyters of Egypt seem to have been called bishops down to a late period, this will account for these Egyptian bishops, in the later sense

of the word, being called, as we have seen, archbishops.

"Strenuous and persistent efforts have been made to shake or evade the force of this statement of Eutychius, but it is far from easy to do so. In the first place, he was Patriarch of Alexandria himself, and however ignorant he may have been in other respects, he may fairly be supposed to have some knowledge of the history of his own Church. Then, his work only professed to be a Chronicle, containing the annals of the Church of Alexandria. Unless, therefore, he invented these stories, he must have derived them from ancient sources, extant in his own day. But the supposition that he invented them cannot be entertained for a moment.

"Eutychius lived at a period when it was a thousandfold more probable that any one, a bishop above all, would forge history to support the theory of exclusive episcopal ordination, than that they would invent it in favor of presbyterianism. Eutychius wrote at a time when episcopal ordination had been pretty firmly established as the rule throughout the whole Christian Church for nearly six centuries. He would be perfectly aware that his statement about Alexandria would have the

effect of lowering the estimation in which his Church was held by the rest of Christendom.

"The truth of the matter is, that St. Jerome tells us the same things as Eutychius in different words. But all that this great Father says upon Episcopacy, and upon the ancient or rather original and apostolic constitution of the Alexandrians, that is to say, the Egyptian Church, is of such immense importance that it will be best to give it in full." Jerome's Comments on Scripture are then presented.

P. 98. "It is indeed most beautiful to find how, as we study the annals of the Primitive Church, the light breaks forth ever more and more clearly upon us. The mists into which later controversialists and upholders of theories have enveloped almost every subject, are dispelled before the bright beams of Truth, and the Church of Christ becomes visible to us, with her fair, pure face, as she was at the beginning.

"All ancient writers are brought into perfect harmony with each other—the Apostles themselves, St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Clement of Rome, Tertullian, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, even St. Cyprian, the traditions of particular Churches, facts of history without number, which no longer require to be explained away, but fit harmoniously into the fair edifice of historical truth, all unite in testifying with

accordant voice what the great doctor of the Church, St. Jerome, proclaims in the words quoted above, that Episcopacy was *not* of the Lord's institution, but was a custom which grew up to take away schism."

Then quoting the language of Jerome with respect to the Alexandrian Church, he writes: "How it is possible for any one, most of all for that school which professes to glory in accepting the Fathers as witnesses to the faith and practice of the Primitive Church, to shut their eyes to the testimony of St. Jerome, is one of those mysteries which will probably always remain a perplexity to the student of moral philosophy.

To the objection that Jerome says: "What is there, except ordination, which a bishop does, which a presbyter may not do?" He replies: "The answer to this is obvious. St. Jerome in this last passage is not writing history; he is not saying what presbyters could or could not do at the beginning of the Church; he merely says that even then, at the close of the fourth century after Christ, after all the innovations which had taken place—the only difference between a bishop and a presbyter was, that it was not lawful for the latter to ordain."

And this no one ever thought of disputing. Every moderately informed person in his day

knew that innovating bishops, such as Alexander, and innovating councils, such as Ancyra, had taken away the rights of the presbytery. And as the whole Church appeared to acquiesce in the loss of freedom for the sake of peace, there was nothing left for such writers at St. Jerome, except to call attention to the *original* identity of bishops and priests.

To the common suggestion that bishops were called in from abroad to consecrate the Alexandrian Patriarch, Mossman replies: "The election of a bishop by presbyters was not such an unusual event in the fourth century, that St. Jerome should go out of his way to point out that it had been the custom in Egypt about a century previous. It must be remembered that St. Jerome felt it a part of his mission to put down episcopal and prelatic pride, and to recall men's minds to the original constitution of the Church; and this being the case, he could have found abundant evidence much nearer at hand, if he had only wanted to show that priests could elect their bishops."

To the supposition that the twelve who elected the patriarch were a college of bishops, it is replied, that there is not a shadow of proof for it, that the idea is opposed by the direct statement of Eutychius; that the patriarch

would have needed no fresh consecration, being already a bishop.

"If we at once recognize the simple fact that, during the third century, the patriarchs of Alexandria gradually altered the original constitution of their Church, and brought it into conformity with the practice of the rest of the Church Catholic, which about A. D. 250 was assuming a rigidly episcopal form, then all becomes clear, simple and straightforward; explanations so called are unneeded, paradoxes vanish, and historical nebulous mists melt away before the keen, searching glance of honest criticism."

P. 102: "Whatever modern writers may assert to the contrary, ancient authors give no countenance to the theory that no alterations have taken place in the Church of Christ. . . . Thus a writer in the fourth century, who passes under the name of Ambrosiaster, and whose writings are usually bound up with those of St. Ambrose, has a remarkable and interesting passage upon the changes which had taken place up to his day. If this writer were, as some learned men suppose, a deacon of the Roman Church named Hilary, his testimony is still more valuable, for while asserting the original absolute identity of bishops and priests,

he speaks strongly of the immense difference between priests and deacons."

Criticising a remark of Hilary about Evangelists, Mossman writes: "The fact that Mark himself, who certainly did not hold any higher rank in the Apostolic Church than that of one of the seventy disciples, in other words, of presbyter, or elder, yet ordained other presbyters, is a proof that presbyters had the power of ordination. If there were any truth in the episcopal theory, that bishops have succeeded in the place of the Apostles, presbyters of the seventy elders, St. Mark ought to have been ordained bishop, before he himself could ordain. But all antiquity testifies that Mark was never anything higher than a presbyter."

After quoting another Hilary, who writes: "For in Alexandria and throughout the whole of Egypt, if a bishop be absent, a presbyter consecrates;" our author says: "Error is long lived and dies hard; but it may perhaps be hoped, that after this nothing further will be heard of bishops being accounted a superior order to priests, upon any higher ground than that of a supposed convenient and profitable ecclesiastical arrangement."

Mossman in his work of 514 pages thoroughly ventilates the whole subject critically, analyzing the writings of Clement, Ignatius, Poly-

carp and St. Hermas; everything in the first two centuries, which can throw light on the early government of the Church.

With respect to the Non-Episcopal Churches —our author thus expresses himself, p. 181: "As for the other so-called sects, such as Lutherans, Calvinists, Moravians, on the continent of Europe; Independents, Baptists, Methodists, in England and America, I have no hesitation in saying, that two great innovations upon primitive spirit and primitive practice are alone answerable for such Christian communities being in a state of separation from the Catholic, or universal Church at all.

"One of these innovations was the invention and growth of the system of Canon Law, commencing with the tremendous forgery of the Apostolic Constitutions, a forgery with which, what is itself a creature of Canon Law the later form of Diocesan Episcopacy, is closely connected.

"The other is the so-called establishment of the Church by Constantine, but which might be much more properly called an establishment of the *temporal* power of the episcopate."

Speaking of the Canons of Ancyra, A. D. 314, he says, p. 491: "I am firmly convinced that the more this part of Church history is studied,

the more clearly it will be seen, that there was no question of distinction of *order* between presbyter and bishop involved in these Canons, simply because that *particular distinction had not as yet been thought of by any one.*"

Thus we see that that distinction, which is now regarded by many as having the force of a divine revelation; is pronounced by this candid Churchman, who has examined the question as ably and thoroughly as any previous writer, not even to have entered the heads of the clergy and laity of the Primitive Church. The whole episcopal scheme of divine right in a third order is proved to be based upon a delusion with no historical basis; and for ages men have been claiming divine prerogatives for functions, for which they have not had the shadow of a right, neither from the word of God, nor from the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church before it was corrupted by alliance with the State; as so fully shown by the writers whose testimony has been presented; scholars of the highest standing in all prominent sections of the Christian Church.

AN ENGLISH JURIST.

In his Cathedra Petri, Thomas Greenwood, a barrister and English Churchman, has given a careful examination of the rise of Episcopacy. "This laborious and important historical work is a credit to modern English scolarship. It is composed *sine ira et studio*, from disinterested love for the subject, in a truth-loving, candid yet critical and genuine historical spirit." Thus writes Dr. Schaff in the Am. Pres. Review, January, 1864, p. 1.

The testimony of this writer is therefore of very great value, as from a jurist of calm judgment, and capable of sifting evidence, and of ascertaining its worth.

Vol. 1, p. 4, we read: "In the absence of all contemporary evidence, we may presume that the outward organization adopted by the Christians of Rome resembled that of like associations in every city where the Gospel had been successfully preached. They had therefore in all probability their *elders* and *deacons* or ministering officers, and numbered among the most active and energetic of their leaders those whom the peculiar gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit had qualified to give the requisite impulse to the Christian scheme. In the Apostolic times the *succession* of bishops was a matter of no im-

portance. The first Christians could have had no other object in view in the choice of their ministers but the fitness of the persons chosen for the extension of the kingdom of Christ, the conversion of the heathen, and the edification of the elect. . . . There is in fact as little reason to believe that presiding ministers, presbyters or deacons, were the strictly stationary officers they afterwards became, as that the Apostles themselves were so."

Passing on to the matter of the Ignatian Epistles, p. 66, he writes: "The ablest scholars of Christendom have, for the last three centuries, been engaged in fruitless attempts to disentangle the text of Ignatius from the mass of clumsy forgery and interpolation by which on all hands it is admitted to have been defaced. The extent of the falsification was in truth the only question in dispute. Referring to the discovery of three Epistles in the Syriac tongue in 1845, and the criticisms of Cureton and Bunsen thereon, in which he agrees, he remarks: "That version we therefore accept as faithfully representing the original Greek text of Ignatius' letters, and consequently the only one available as evidence of the real character of the ecclesiastical system of the Ignatian period."

"It would be very rash to presume that the unity of the Christian body was then regarded

as dependent upon the adoption of one uniform outward organization. It is even probable that many Churches—*e. g.*, those of Corinth and Alexandria—were not yet episcopally constituted; and it is apparent that the mention of a bishop or presiding elder in the Church of Smyrna, can go no way to prove any distinction between him and his fellow-laborers, the presbytery and the diaconate, other than that of a simple presidency.

"Jerome says that the Church of Alexandria was originally governed by a college of presbyters under the presidency of one of their own body, with the title of *proedros:* a term implying a chairmanship of a popular assembly rather than a permanent office like that of the bishop in Jerome's age. *Eusebius*, however (l. vi., 26, 35), gives the presiding officers of the Alexandria Church the title of bishop. I am unable to explain the discrepancy, unless it be that Jerome's remark applies to an earlier period than that spoken of by Eusebius.

P. 137, quoting the language of Jerome, he writes: "In the last years, therefore, of the period under review, and nearly three-quarters of a century after the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the State, we find the most eminent doctor of the Latin Church declining to place the title of the Episcopacy upon

the ground of divine ordinance, expressly reducing it to that of religious expediency. The questions, therefore, present themselves unbidden—Was Jerome ignorant of the existence of the Ignatian and Cyprianic writings? or had those fabrications not yet made way enough in the Christian world to reach the learned circle of which Jerome formed in some sort the centre?

"Setting aside the so-called 'Clementines' and 'Recognitions,' are we to suppose that the more ancient and respectable compilations known as the 'Apostolical Constitutions' and 'Canons' had escaped his notice? or that he was inclined to treat them as harmless fictions, not perhaps incapable of some useful application on behalf of the hierarchical order so fully constituted in his age?

"Without attempting an answer to these questions, it may be observed that the idea of Episcopacy conveyed to us in the work of Jerome, as cited above, does not advance a step beyond the genuine Ignatian idea as deducible from the original Syriac letters; while, on the other hand, it presents a striking contrast to the hierarchical theory so fully unfolded in the suppositious writings of the martyr bishop, and in those attributed to Cyprian of Carthage."

P. 111: "Throughout the whole of the third century the hierarchical and monarchical prin-

ciples appear to have proceeded *pari passu* towards that fullness of pretension we find them to have arrived at in the fourth. And, indeed, it is believed that the Cyprianic writings, or those among them which are most open to suspicion, must have seen the light before the close of the latter era—probably within the same period of time which gave birth to the Clementine and pseudo-Ignatian fictions.

"Mr. *Shepherd*, in his 'History of the Church of Rome,' has pointed out many circumstances of suspicion attaching to the 'Letters of Cyprian,' which impugn the genuineness of those productions. But we cannot go with him the length of regarding Cyprian himself as a mythical personage.

"In the preface to the second volume, p. xvi., this author while regarding the Episcopal form as the most desirable, remarks: 'Its history discloses to us that it cannot be exalted into an article of belief; that it was not intended to present a perfected form; nor—as was the case with the Mosaic priesthood—is there in that writing anything to *identify* it with the moral or dogmatic teaching of the Church. Regarding the institution *as an instrument* with the highest reverence, we do and say all that the facts connected with its first institution warrant us doing and saying. And if we go an inch further, we

are inevitably involved in the dogma of a perpetual revelation, and driven to search for the particular body in which that revelation resides, —a task which lies far out of the beat of the historical student."

It is here seen that the view of Greenwood corresponds with that presented by another of the legal profession, in Ch. vii. p. 68. W. A. Garrett. We thus have clergymen, and laymen; Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists, and also Roman Catholics; giving their joint and overwhelming testimony to the absence of an episcopal succession in the Primitive Church of Alexandria; or of a distinction of Order in the offices of bishop and presbyter. If there is any certain fact pertaining to the Primitive Church, it is that here considered.

We close our array of witnesses, with the presentation of a modern Roman Catholic *savant*, Professor Ellendorf, of Berlin.

A ROMAN CATHOLIC WITNESS.

In his work on the Roman Primacy in which he makes clear that there is no historical proof that Peter was ever in Rome, (which fact Greenwood in his Cathedra Petri has also satisfactory established), he inquires, p. 244: "What Church constitution did the Apostles ordain?

The Catholic Church says: 'These presbyters *were* not *priests* but *bishops of the present day.* These are, *kat'exochen*, the successors of the Apostles, appointed by them to be heads and rulers of the individual Churches, and for this end entrusted with a special higher power, which was imparted to them by a peculiar consecration. Under them stand as *subordinates of a lower order* of rank, the *priests* properly, who were consecrated by the bishops, while the former could only be consecrated by archbishops. The latter have the exclusive right to administer the sacraments of confirmation and consecration. In every Church there can and must be only *one* bishop; while the number of priests may be large. The bishops form the first order of rank, *appointed by God* in the Church, while the *priests* make up the *second.*' "

"The inquiry now is, whether there were such bishops in the Apostolical Church as a specially appointed institution given by Christ?

"After we have carefully examined and compared all the writings of the New Testament, and have likewise consulted the oldest traditions after the time of the Apostles, we see ourselves forced decisively to reply in the negative to this question, and to hold firmly by the view, that originally there were no bishops in the present sense; that from the beginning on-

ward, bishop and priest formed *one and the same* rank and grade, *one and the same* dignity ; that at first the priests were appointed by the Apostles to be pastors of the Church ; and that they, as well according to the name as in fact were bishops ; that the present episcopate is not of *divine* but *historical* origin.

"This one view, which is a vital question agitated between the Catholic and Protestant Church, *we will prove by incontestible reasons, as the only true and correct one.*

"If the present episcopate is of divine origin, it must of necessity, according to its essence, show itself in the apostolical century, namely, in the time of the Apostles themselves.

"a. Accurately distinguished from the priests and be placed above them.

"b. They must have possessed and exercised a peculiar higher power above the priests : (1) special care for the preservation of doctrine and discipline : (2) the distribution of the sacrament of confirmation and the consecration of the priests.

"c. In every Church there must have been only *one* bishop, and he must show himself in every case.

"Yet of all these things there is not a single trace, but precisely the contrary, as we shall show.

"It is not to be conceived how in spite of these expressions of the holy Scriptures, so clear and unquestionably, there could have arisen, in the Catholic Church, the opinion that *bishops* and *elders* were different, and that the former constituted a rank, appointed by Christ, above the latter. But the grounds by which the advocates of the episcopate defend this as a divine institution, correspond completely to the utter baselessness of the view."

Ellendorf proceeds to meet the arguments of Walter, whom he styles "the most powerful and skillful defender of the Catholic Church constitution and hierarchy, at the present day," and thus concludes:

"From these numerous witnesses capable of no other interpretation, and that cannot be refuted, we draw the conclusion that in the Apostolical Church there were no bishops as a higher order of rank above priests, appointed by Christ; that, still more, bishops and priests were one and the same, and that accordingly, in any Church, were as many bishops as there were priests, who united in a college—*the presbytery—in common* (or collectively), administered the highest government in the Church." Bib. Sacra, Jany., 1859, p. 112.

A CRITICISM ON THE ARGUMENT FROM JEROME.

Some argue that the language of Jerome implies that the change to Episcopacy was made in the apostolic age.

Sanders, the Romanist, asserted that bishops had been appointed by the Church, after the Schism in Corinth, with the approbation of the Apostles, though not under their direction, and appealed in proof of it to the testimony of Jerome.

ARGUMENT OF DR. WHITTAKER.

He was answered by Prof. Whittaker, of Cambridge, King's Prof. of Divinity, among the most learned of the Elizabethean divines: "I answer Sanders plainly, either that he does not understand, or has not attended to what Jerome intends. For, although during the lives of the Apostles some said, 'I am of Paul,' 'I of Cephas,' 'I of Apollos,' and Jerome writes, *before* it was said, 'I am of Paul,' etc.; nevertheless, Jerome does not think that this order was changed by the Apostles, but subsequently by the judgment of the Church. This Jerome signifies when he says, 'Presently throughout the whole world it was decreed that one elected out of the presbyters should be placed above the rest.' Was the thing thus done decreed

by the Apostles? Jerome himself answers: 'As in fact the presbyters,' he says, 'know that they are subjected to a bishop placed over them *by custom of the Church.*'

"Jerome says 'by custom of the Church,' not by the decree of the Apostles; then he adds: 'Thus the bishops may know that they are superior to presbyters by custom, rather than by the fact of our Lord's appointment.' But if the Apostles had changed that order, and had placed bishops before presbyters, and had forbidden that thereafter the Churches should be governed by the general council of the presbyters, *that, indeed, would have been a divine arrangement, as set forth by the Apostles of Christ;* unless those things which the Apostles had decreed, should be ascribed to custom, and not to the divine arrangement.

"But during the lives of the Apostles, nothing was changed in this order. For the Epistle to the Corinthians was written when Paul was engaged in Macedonia; but after this time he left Titus in Crete, that he might appoint presbyters in each town; Tit. i. 5. If the Apostle had thought that the order should be changed, he would not have directed that presbyters should be appointed in each town; nor would Jerome have brought testimony from Paul—Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2, etc.—by which he could

demonstrate that a presbyter was the same as a bishop. Paul had written his Epistle to the Philippians, to Timothy, to Titus, and Peter his, and John his after that schism arose in Corinth, and Luke also had written that the presbyters of Ephesus, after that schism, were called together by Paul at Miletus.

"When Jerome, relying fully on these passages (Epist. to Evagrius), contends that a presbyter is equal to a bishop in all respects, he could not be so unmindful of himself as to have supposed that the arrangement was made by the Apostles. So, elsewhere, when he had subjoined the testimony of Scripture, by which he proved that the bishops and presbyters were not different things, he adds: 'Afterwards one was elected who should be over the others.' If '*afterwards* one was elected who should be superior to presbyters,' therefore the Apostles did not introduce the distinction, but a certain ecclesiastical custom or arrangement." Contro. 4. Quaes. 1, cap. 3, sect. 29.

MODERATION OF WHITGIFT.

Dr. Saravia, Prebend of Canterbury, presents the same plea with regard to St. Jerome's meaning, as Sanders. This divine has been quoted as an asserter of exclusive Episcopacy. But two considerations are here worthy of notice.

Archbishop Whitgift, in a letter to Beza, given in full by Strype, in his Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 156, states that Saravia had written in defence of the English Church against the assaults of Beza, briefly, he says: "The purpose of Dr. Saravia to assert degrees among the ministers of the Gospel was wholly undertaken without the injury and prejudice of any particular Church; that on them the necessity of defending the truth and ourselves was thus first imposed by others. But I would have you, worthy sir, persuade yourself of this, that there is no mortal man more studious than myself for the peace of the Church, nor from his very soul, more truly wisheth that every particular Church would mind its own business, and not prescribe the laws of rites, and the manner of government to others. For this is the apple of contention, if anything else be, which bringeth forth that unhappy estrangement among brethren (how little soever it be discerned), and will still bring it forth, unless it be timely prevented."

"Most learned and most dear brother in Christ, farewell. February, 1594. Your most loving brother and fellow-servant in Christ, John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in England."

This letter establishes conclusively, that previous to 1594, no English Episcopal divine had

advanced exclusive claims for Episcopacy, such as are now, unfortunately so common, and moreover, that the controversial works on the subject were defensive, and not antagonistic to the Presbyterian Communions on the continent, here fully acknowleged as Churches of Christ.

Saravia, and Sutcliff, Bishops Jewel, Bridges, Cooper, Bancroft and Bilson, who had previously written, are here vindicated from Episcopal exclusiveness and bigotry, by their superior, with whose approval they had published their works. Hooker, about the same time, wrote with equal charity and moderation.

SARAVIA ORDAINED BY PRESBYTERS.

Again, with regard to Dr. Saravia, another fact, bearing strongly on this question deserves special notice. It is stated by an eminent layman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the course of a thorough discussion of a topic cognate to that which is here considered. Col. J. M. Patton of Virginia, in his argument on the "Validity of Min. Orders," before that Diocese, remarks, p. 18: "Rev. Adrian A. Saravia was an intimate friend of Hooker's in the last years of his life, a distinguished theologian, and one of the translators of the Bible under James I. Though a Presbyterian only by ordination, he

was zealous for Episcopal government of the Church, in Hooker's sense of it.

"It can be proved that though he held such high positions in the Anglican Church, he, like so many others (the great multitude of whom Keble speaks), never considered it necessary to take Episcopal orders, and never had them. . . .

And so Hooker, who had never denied in his life, but always maintained, the validity of Presbyterial orders, sealed their validity at his death, by receiving absolution and the supper of the Lord, at the hands of a Presbyterian divine."

Saravia, like the Alexandria divines, while maintaining strongly an Episcopal polity, it seems, laid no especial stress, like our modern High Churchmen, on an Episcopal succession.

SELDEN'S VERSION OF EUTYCHIUS.

"Constituit item Marcus Evangelista duodecim Presbyteros cum Hanania qui nempe manerent cum Patriarcha, adeo ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus, eligerent unum e duodecim Presbyteris cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus imponerent, eumque benedicerent et Patriarcham eum crearent, et dein virum aliquem insignem eligerent, eumque Presbyterum secum constituerent loco ejus qui sic factus est Patriarcha, ut ita semper extarent duodecim. Neque desiit Alexandriæ institutum hoc de Presbyteris, ut scilicet Patriarchas crearent ex Presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri Patriarchæ Alexandrini, qui fuit ex numero illo cccxviii. Is autem vetuit ne deinceps Patriarcham Presbyteri crearent. Et decrevit, ut mortuo Patriarcha, convenient Episcopi qui Patriarcham ordinarent. Decrevit item, ut vacante Patriarchatu, eligerent sive ex qua cunque regione, sive ex duodecim illis Presbyteris, sive aliis, ut res ferebat, virum aliquem eximium, eumque Patriarcham crearent. Atque ita evanuit institutum illud antiquius, quo creari solitus a Presbyteris Patriarcha, et successit in locum ejus decretum de Patriarcha ab Episcopis creando." EUTYCH. PATR. ALEX. Ecclesiæ suæ orig. Ed. J. Selden. Lond. 1642. 4to. pp. 29–31. Of Selden see above, p. 85.

BISHOP JEWEL ON JEROME.

Bishop Jewel, whom Hooker styled "the worthiest divine which Christendom hath produced these hundreds of years," in his "Defence of Apology"—a book placed in all the churches of England by order of the Queen, and Archbishops, writes, vol. iii., p. 294: "St. Jerome saith, 'Let bishops understand that they are above priests rather of custom than of any truth or right of Christ's institution; and that they ought to rule the Church altogether.' And again, 'Therefore a priest and a bishop are both one thing; and before that by the inflaming of the devil, parts were taken in religion, and these words were uttered among the people, 'I hold of Peter, I hold of Apollos, I hold of Peter,' the churches were governed by the common advice of the priests.'" P. 439: "He saith somewhat in rougher sort: 'I hear say there is one become so peevish that he setteth deacons before priests, that is to say before bishops; whereas the apostle plainly teaches us that priests and bishops are both one.'" . . .

"St. Augustine saith: 'The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest (not by authority of the Scriptures, but) after the names of honor, which the custom of the Church has now obtained.'" Parker Soc. Ed.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX.

CONCERNING JEROME AND THE CONTINENTAL REFORMERS.

As will be seen from what has preceded, there has been a contest since the Reformation, over the meaning of the statements of this pre-eminently learned writer.

The controversy has arisen from later authors attempting to make the language of Jerome to square with the views of modern High Churchmen, who hold to a third order in the ministry, by divine right; instead of with those who preceded him, and who lived within two centuries after the Apostles.

The testimony here presented has made it clear that Jerome, did not hold to the view, which among English writers, was first held by the School of Laud, and his sympathizers; and which has been so strongly pressed by the Oxford Tractarians, and those who sympathize with them here, and in the mother country.

The attempt to twist the meaning of this distinguished father of the Post-Nicene Church has failed.

The view which Antiquity took of Jerome's language, the same as that of the English, and Continental Reformers; cannot be overthrown.

This is acknowledged by a famous Roman Catholic author, Alphonsus De Castro, Archbishop of Campostello, who came to England with Philip II. and who in his Book, *Contra Heres*, p. 103, rebukes a writer who sought to evade Jerome's clear testimony, thus: "But Thomas Waldensis truly is deceived; for Jerome does endeavor to prove that according to divine institution, there was no difference between presbyter and bishop."

We have seen what was the view of Cranmer, as often expressed. The same was that of Bishops Cox and Pilkington, and Dr. Redmayn, Prayer Book Revisers; of Bishop Alley, and Lambert and Fulke; of Dean Field and Bishops Morton and Bedell; of Professor Whittaker, of Cambridge, and Bishop Jewel; who repeatedly refer to Jerome as an authority to establish the fact, that by the word of God, there are but two orders in the Christian ministry.

THE CONTINENTAL REFORMERS.

If we pass to the Continent, we find the most eminent Reformers also referring to Jerome for authority.

This is nowhere more prominent than in the

Smalkald Articles, 1537, drawn up by Luther, and signed by Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Myconius, Bucer, Fagius, and other illustrious Reformers. Here we read: "Wherefore Jerome plainly affirms, that there is no difference between a bishop and a presbyter; but that every pastor is a bishop. Here Jerome teaches that the distinction of degrees between a bishop and a presbyter or pastor, was only appointed by human authority, and the thing itself imports no less; for on both bishop and presbyter is laid the same duty, and the same charge. Only ordination, in after times, made the difference between bishop and pastor. By divine right there is no difference between a bishop and a pastor or presbyter; orders communicated by the later are valid, because of divine right; the power of jurisdiction or government belongs to all pastors or presbyters, and has been unlawfully and shamefully appropriated to themselves by diocesan bishops.".

As this document was agreed to and signed by the Electors, Dukes, Counts, Barons, Consuls and Senators from thirty-five cities, together with eight thousand clergymen; it establishes the fact that the Lutheran Reformers received the teachings of Jerome, in the same sense with Cranmer and his associates. The last public Document of the Lutheran Church, The

Syllabus of Controverted Points," ch. 18, § 4, is no less explicit; "ordination to the work of the ministry is necessary in a church at liberty; but this act does not belong to bishops alone, nor can it with propriety be called a sacrament. We hold this in opposition to the Papists, and also to certain English Episcopalians, as Carleton, Hall and Bilson, who distinguish between presbyters and bishops, as to the point of ordination."

The Confessions of Saxony, 1551; of Wirtenburg, 1552; of Belgium, 1556; of Bohemia, 1573; contain similar statements. The second Helvetic confession, 1566, was signed not only by the Swiss, but by the Churches of Geneva, Hungary, Savoy, Polonia, Scotland and others; and this document after referring to Jerome's testimony, reads: "Thus far Jerome; now therefore no man can forbid, by any right, that we may return to the old appointment of God, and rather receive that, than the custom devised by men. . . . The power that is given to the ministers of the Church is the same in all; and in the beginning, the bishops or elders, did with a common consent and labor govern the Church. No man lifted himself up above another."

THE CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

Such was the view taken by the Church of Holland. One of the articles of the famous Synod of Dort, 1618, is: "As for the ministers of God's word, they have equally the power and authority wheresoever they are." In a work entitled "Synopsis Theologiae," prepared by Polyander, Thysius and Walaeus, members of that Synod, and Professors in three Dutch Universities; xlii. § 29, etc., we read: "The practice of investing one person from among the presbyters, with the authority of President, and giving him by way of eminence, the title of bishop, was not a divine but a mere human appointment, and was brought in after the Apostles' time; as, after Jerome, many of the Papists themselves confess, particularly Lombard, Gratian, Cusan and others."

Similar views were held by the Danish Church which retained Episcopacy. The first Danish Confession—1537—states that "True bishops or priests are all the same." The King of Denmark, as Duke of Holstein, signed the Articles of Smalkald 1538. Vandalin, Professor of Theology in Copenhagen, writes, 1727: "Are bishops and presbyters distinct orders by divine risht? We deny it; in opposition to the Pa-

pists and to certain persons of the Church of England."

The Swedish Church, also Episcopal, takes this view of the human origin of the episcopate. See Miller's Letters, p. 274.

THE CHURCH OF FRANCE.

The remaining Continental Church, that of France, in her Confession, takes the same ground. The language of two of her most eminent divines will testify to the point. And first, Calvin, whom Hooker styles "a worthy vessel of God's glory—the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy," and Bishop Andrews: "an illustrious person, and never to be mentioned without a preface of the highest honor." Bishop Carleton well remarks in relation to the smaller lights who have abused this illustrious Christian's memory: "Some take it for a sign looking towards Popery, when the members of our own Church offer such a service to the Papists, as to speak evil of them that have been the greatest enemies of Popery, the greatest propagators of the truth."

Calvin, from whose Genevan Prayer Book, was taken the Introductory portion of our Morning service, and of the Communion Office, and whose work is thus so strikingly stamped upon our Book of Common Prayer; in the

preparation of which his counsel was so sought, valued, and followed, by the founders of the Church of England, is most emphatic in his language concerning the meaning of Jerome. From his Institutes, long a text book in the University of Oxford, we quote, Book iv. ch. 4: "Jerome in his commentary on the Epistle to Titus saith: A presbyter was the same as a bishop, &c. . . . And in another place (Epist. ad Evagr), he teaches how ancient an institution this was: for he says that at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, down to Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters always placed one chosen out of their number in a higher station and called him bishop. Every city then had a college of Presbyters, who were pastors and teachers, and who all executed among the people the offices of instructing, exhorting and exercising discipline, which Paul enjoins on bishops. Titus, 1, 9. And every one of these colleges (as I said before), was under the presidency of one bishop who was only so far above the rest in dignity, as to be himself subject to the assembly of his brethren."

On Philip, 1, 1, again referring to Jerome, he says: "Afterwards it became customary that he who presided in the bench of presbyters of a particular Church, should alone be called bishop. This, however, arose from human cus-

tom, and is by no means supported by Scripture." . . . Out of the corrupted signification of a word, this evil arose, that thence, as if all the presbyters were not colleagues, and called to the same function, one, under the pretext of a new title, arrogated to himself a dominion over others." . . . On Acts xiv. 28, he writes: "It arose from corruption, and a departure from primitive purity, that those who held the first seats in particular cities, began to be called bishops. I say that it arose from corruption, not that it is an evil for some one, in each college of pastors, to be distinguished above the the rest; but because it is an intolerable presumption, that men in perverting the titles of Scripture to their own humor, do not hesitate to alter the meaning of the Holy Spirit."

Calvin's own words, often and plainly expressed, settle the fact that he was entirely satisfied with his own Presbyterian ordination, and felt himself fully empowered to take the part of ordaining others into the presbytery.

TESTIMONY OF CLAUDE.

We close this testimony of the Continental Reformers, with another famous divine of the French Church, Claude, the antagonist of Bossuet; according to Mosheim, a man "of great erudition and eloquence," at whose death Wil-

liam of Orange shed tears. In his celebrated "Historical Defence of the Reformation," he uses decided language on the point here discussed: p. 372. "Can this author be ignorant of the opinion of St. Jerome, of Hilary the deacon, and after them of Hincmar; which they have so explicitly given, concerning the unity or identity of the office of bishop or presbyter, in the earliest ages of the Church; and concerning the origin of that distinction which afterwards took place between them. Can he be ignorant that St. Augustin himself, writing to St. Jerome, refers that distinction, not to the primitive institution of the ministry, but merely to an ecclesiastical custom which has since grown up? Can he be ignorant that some of the fathers have taught us, that the ordination of a presbyter and a bishop are strictly one and the same, and not different kinds of acts, sufficiently expressing to us the identity of the offices." Claude, in language which reflects the present sentiments of the great body of Protestant ministers, with respect to the baseless and offensive claims of the High Church exclusive Successionists, indignantly repudiates these assumptions and proceeds: "Can he deny that presbyters anciently ordained equally with bishops? The right of ordination is one that naturally belongs to presbyters. And since

they have been deprived of it by rules and constitutions, which are merely of human authority, the right still remains essentially attached to their office, and they may justly reclaim it, whenever the state of the Church will permit.

"And that I may declare my opinion with freedom, it appears to me that the haughty and insolent opinion, which maintains the absolute necessity of Episcopal ordinations, and without them annihilates the Church, the ministry and the sacraments, however pure the faith, the doctrine and the piety of the Church may be: thus making religion depend on a form, and that form a mere human invention. I repeat it, it appears to me that this insolent opinion carries on it the character of a shameful corruption; it bears the mark of profound hypocrisy, of a pure pharisaism, which strains at a gnat, while it swallows a camel. I cannot help having, at least, a deep contempt for such opinions, and compassion for those who are thus obstinate and headstrong in maintaining them."

A letter of Claude's having been published, by some who claimed that he greatly favored Episcopal government, such as was in England; in 1681, Claude wrote to the Bishop of London and also to a lady, stating that the former letter was not intended for the public: that it greatly misrepresented him (as has been the

case with Jerome), that "he was surprised and astonished to see it as well in French as in English; that he had two things in view, to justify us from the calumny which some persons imputed to us of believing that salvation could not be obtained under the Episcopal government," and of aiding "a good and holy union of the two parties."

He says also: "The Non-Conformists complain . . . that you will receive no one to the ministry, till he acknowledges, on oath, that Episcopacy is of divine right, which is a hell to the conscience. They complain, that, whilst you do not re-ordain the Roman Catholic priests who come to you, you re-ordain ministers, who come to you from beyond the seas, in the Churches of France, Holland, etc. They complain that the bishops have a rigid attachment to many ceremonies which are offensive, and for which, nevertheless, they combat *tanquam pro aris et focis.* In the name of God, my Lord, labor to remove these grounds of complaint, if there is any truth in them; if there is not, to give information of the real state of the case. And let all Europe know that there is nothing which the glory of God, and the love of the Church can demand of you, that you are not ready to grant."

Strange is it, that, now, two hundred years

after this letter, in this free land of light; this same baseless, offensive, and harmful claim is troubling our Protestant Israel; limiting the comfort, influence and power of Christian ministers; an obstacle to the progress of charity, courtesy and peace; an unhealthy and unsightly fungus on the Body of Christ.

CONCLUSION.

We can find no better words with which to close our Inquiry than those of the lamented Professor Hatch, and his able critics.

With respect to differing forms of Church government Dr. Hatch writes, p. 213: "The fact of the necessity and desirability of form is no proof of the necessity and desirability of this or that particular form. Nor is the fact that a particular form was good for a particular age a proof that it is also good for another age. The history of the organization of Christianity has been in reality the history of successive readjustments of form to altered circumstances. Its power of readjustment has been at once a mark of its divinity and a secret of its strength." p. 215. "The most significant fact of modern Christian history is that within the last hundred years, many millions of our own race and our own Church, without departing from the ancient faith, have

slipped from beneath the inelastic framework of the ancient organization, and formed a group of new societies on the basis of a closer Christian brotherhood, and an almost absolute democracy."

This brilliant, scholarly and candid work has been left as a rich legacy to the Church, by this gifted divine, removed so unexpectedly in the fullness of his powers, and with the promise of greater results.

Professor Fairbairn alluding to the recent death of Dr. Hatch in the Cont. Rev., March, 1890, p. 405, remarks of him: "Who of all recent Oxford men most fulfilled the ideal of the scholar in Theology, and applied in a spirit as reverent as it was thorough, the scientific method to the history of ecclesiastical institutions. But there was no man who more thoroughly believed, or who was so armed with proofs to support his belief, that Anglo-catholicism was utterly unhistorical, as Edwin Hatch."

DR. R. B. WELCH.

We have in the timely criticism of Dr. Ransom B. Welsh, Professor in Auburn Seminary, on the offer of the Historic Episcopate by the House of Prot. Epis. Bishops, and the replies to it, in the Presby. Rev., July, 1888, reference to Dr. Hatch, and extracts from his work. These we

present, with interesting and pertinent remarks on the offer which has attracted so much attention. After quoting Dr. Jacob, Dr. Welch says, p. 358: "Dr. Hatch proceeds at length to show, 'by what gradual steps the Congregational System of early times passed into the *Diocesan* System of later times; how the *National* Churches arose from Communities becoming grouped in larger combinations on the political lines, first of the Roman administration, and afterwards of the newly-formed kingdoms of the West, so as to form the aggregates or units which are known as National Churches (Roman, Anglican, etc.).'"

"It has no doubt been sometimes maintained that the diocese in its modern sense is an institution of primitive times. But the recorded facts are far from supporting this view. . . . In earlier times such a system would have been impossible;" again, "the idea that ordination conveys not merely *status* but *character*, and still more the idea that such character is indellible, are foreign to primitive times." There is, he says, "such variance (of the primitive and Eastern) with the Western Church in later times, and especially with the Church of England as hardly to be credible except upon the clearest evidence," which he proceeds to give with the successive modifications and readapta-

tions from the Congregational system of early Christianity, to the diocesan system of mediæval times." He adds: "Hence Dr. Jacob's *conclusion* is in keeping with Dr. Hatch: 'that in such matters the Church may appoint in any mode which may be deemed most expedient, amenable only to the general law of decency and order; that to restrict ordination to the hands of bishops is owing to no divine law or apostolic prescription." Confirmatory authorities are referred to and largely quoted from Jerome to Lightfoot. The resultant is thus substantially stated on the one hand: "However the Churches like our own may prefer the Episcopal government and ordination; yet on the other hand, the government and ordinations of the Presbyterian Churches are just as valid, Scriptural and apostolic as our own" (pp. 114, 115).

As Dr. Welch so fully reflects the mind of the Non-Episcopal Churches with respect to the reordination which is expected of them, on accepting the basis of unity proposed, his remarks are valuable and pertinent, and we therefore give them. On p. 356, he says, with reference to the language of some of the Prot. Epis. bishops in connection with this offer: "From the Episcopal statements just quoted, is it not apparent to what committal those may

be exposed, who would accept the Declaration of the House of Bishops without conference—a committal to open and high sacerdotalism, sacramentarianism and Episcopal control; a clerical priesthood divinely empowered (and it alone empowered) as a mediating, sacrificing, absolving order—strictly and consummately a hierarchical order through which is given effect to every Christian ordinance, even regenerating men in baptism, actually offering the body and blood of Christ in the sacrifice of the Eucharist, absolving from sin or condemning under the terrors of excommunication, and including 'the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession' as essential to our definition of a valid ministry."

Having presented the views of the Reformers and great divines of England down to the present day, as declared in the language of Dr. Stanley, "According to the strict rules of the Church derived from the early times, there are but two orders—presbyters and deacons" (the view publicly asserted by the Reformed Episcopal Church, which alone distinctly represents the English Reformation). Dr. W. concludes thus: "Here, within the Episcopal Church, and by high authority earlier and later, is furnished an alternative to the extreme and exclusive views of historic Episcopacy. According to the broader and more primitive view, there

is not only place but occasion for 'brotherly conference' and mutual correction.

"Here there is ground for possible conciliation and practical compromise. Here is an open and sure 'way out of denominationalism,' to copy a phrase from the *Churchman*—a way no less practicable, it would seem, for the Episcopal than for the Non-Episcopal, illustrated, according to the same paper, by the practice to-day in the historical, philological, and scientific world, of 'discovering truth by comparison of views;' and we might add, not according to the practice of former days by ecclesiastical decrees assuming and dictating what shall be scientific truth. The application is easy.

"Many candid, wise and noble men, Episcopal no less than Non-Episcopal, see in this direction not only a way out of denominationalism, but into Christian unity—not into absorption and uniformity, but into Christian co-operation and intercommunion."

The way fortunately has already been made easy, and when the Protestant Episcopal Church has conformed itself to the ways of the Primitive Church, and to the views of the Reformed Episcopacy of Cranmer and his fellow-workers; as has been already done by anticipation, thoroughly by the Reformed Episcopal Church; when it has, throwing off its weights, elevated

itself to this Apostolic platform; it can assist in promoting Christian unity. On no other grounds can its offers of peace and union be consistently and favorably received, by the great body of Protestant Christians in this and other lands.

"How I wish there had been no presidency, no preference of place, no arbitrary privilege, that we might be distinguished by virtue only. But now this right hand, and left hand, and middle, and higher, and lower; this going before, and following in company, have produced us much unprofitable affliction, brought many into a snare, and thrust them away into the company of the goats: not only of the inferior class, but also of the shepherds, who being masters in Israel, have not known these things." Gregory Nazianzen, Archbp. of Constantinople.

INDEX.

A.

PAGE

Alford, Dean, Testimony of 189
Amalarius, " 208
Ambrose, " 21
Anonymous Author, " 195

B

Babington, Bp., Testimony of 186
Bacon, Lord, " 231
Bancroft, Abp., " 184
Bangs, Dr , " 114
Baxter, Richard. " 150
Bingham, " 17
Bowdler, " 78
Bradford, John, " 168
Brown, Dr., " 138
Bullinger, " 26
Burnet, Bp., " 4

C.

Calthill, Testimony of 183
Campbell, Dr., " 142
Coleman, Lyman, " 121
Cosin, Bp., " 4
Cranmer, Abp , Liberality of 7
" " Testimony of 175
Cumming, Dr., " 127

D.

Davenant, Bp., Testimony of 187

E.

PAGE

Edward VI., Patent granted by 6
Essays on the Church, Notice of 217
Eutychius, Testimony of . 19

F.

Field, Dean, Testimony of 186
Fleetwood, Bp., " 5
Fulke, Dr., " 181

G.

Garratt, W. A., Argument of 69
Giesler, Testimony of . 108
Goode, Dr., " . 56
Griswold, Bp., " . 320

H.

Hall, Bp., Testimony of . 3
Hallam, " . 5
Harrison, John, Confirmatory evidence of 212
Hase, Dr., Testimony of 15
Herzog, " 111
Hilary, " 21
Hoadley, Bp., " 156
Hooker, Richard, " 153
Hooper, Bp., " 173
Hopkins, Bp., " 191
Hospinian, " 15
Howe, Prof., " 14

J.

PAGE

Jarvis, Examination of . 94
Jerome, St., Testimony of . 22
Jewel, Bp., " . 176

K.

Keble, Testimony of . . 3
Killen, Dr., " . . 131

L.

Latimer, Bp., Testimony of 173
Laud, Abp., " 188
Layman, A., " 217
Litton, Prof., " 55
Lord, Dr., " 10

M.

Macaulay, Testimony of . 5
Mahan, Dr., Examination of 96
Mason, Francis, Testimony of 184
Morinus, " 81
Musgrave, Abp., " 192

N.

Neale, Rev. J. M. Argument of 87
Neander, Testimony of . 110

O.

O'Brien, Bp., Testimony of . 190

P.

Pearson, Dean, Testimony of 189
Percival, Dr., Examination of 87
Philpot, Archdeacon, Testimony of . . . 175
Pilkington, Bp., Testimony of 180
Powell, Thomas, " 111

R.

PAGE

Rainolds, Dr., Testimony of 30
Riddle, Rev. J. E., " 59, 64
Ridley, Bp., " 171
"Rights of the Christian Church," Notice of 195

S.

Schaff, Dr., Testimony of 107
Severus, " 21
Smith, Dr., " 192
Stanley, Dean, " 16, 54
Stevens, Abel, " 116
Stillingfleet, Bp., " 47
Strype, " 3
Sumner, Abp., " 193

T.

Tertullian, Testimony of . 63
Tostatus, " . 210
Tyler, Prof., " . 12

U.

Usher, Abp., Testimony of . 45

V

Via Media, Theory of . . 214

W.

Warren, Dr., Testimony of 227
Wharton, Dr., " 191
White, Francis, Bp., " 187
White, Thomas, " 187
Whitgift, Abp., Order of . 27
" " Testimony of 24
Whittaker, Dr., " 181
"Whose are the Fathers?" Notice of . . . 206
Willet, Dr., Testimony of 34, 181
Wilson, Dr., " 116

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENT.

A.

PAGE

Ambrosiaster, . . . 300
Ancyra, Council of, 281, 283, 299, 302
Andrews, Bp., on Calvin, 326
Augustine, . . 320, 329
Asbury, Bp., . . . 243

B.

Basnage, . . . 249, 253
Baxter, ... 264
British Quarterly, . . 289
Boardman, H. A., . . 276
Bunsen on Ignatius, . . 305
Burnet, Bp., . . 249, 266

C.

Calvin, . . . 326–8
Carleton, Bp., on Calvin, 326
Chrysostom, . . . 279
Claude, . . . 328–31
Coke, Bp., . . . 244
Conder, ... 249
Conclusion, . . . 333
Cranmer, ... 267
Cyprian, ... 308

D.

Danish Confession, . . 325
De Castro, . . . 322
Doddridge, . . . 254
Dort, Synod of, . . 325
Dwight, Dr. T., . . 267

E.

PAGE

Ellendorf, ... 309
Emory, Bp., . . . 245
Eusebius, ... 265
Eutychius, . . . 319

F.

Fisher, Prof., . . . 261
Flaccus, Albinus, . . 293
Fairbairn, Principal, 287, 293
France, Church of, . . 326

G.

Gore, Rev. C., . . 237, 293
Greenwood, . . . 304

H.

Hall, E. E., . . . 255
Hatch, Dr. E., . 287, 332, 334
Hilary, . . . 259, 285
Hitchcock, Prof., . . 258
Hincmar, ... 339
Hobart, Bp., . . . 271
Hooker on Calvin, . . 326
Holland, Church of, . . 325

J.

Jacob, G. A., . . 287, 335
Jenkins, Canon, . . 250
Jewel, Bp., . . . 320

L.

PAGE

Lightfoot, Bp., . 282-4
Luther, ... 323
Lutheran Syllabus, . . 324

M.

Mark, a Presbyter, . . 301
Mason, J. M., . . . 268
Melancthon, . . . 323
Merriam, G. S., . . 254
Miller, S. Prof., . . 266
Mossman, ... 294

N.

Non-Epis. Churches, 294, 304, 331
Novatus, ... 292

P.

Patton, J. M., . . . 317
Paphnutius, . . . 292
Peck, Dr. G., . . . 246

R.

Renaudot, . . . 264

S.

PAGE

Sacerdotalism. 262, 287, 336
Sanders, ... 318
Saravia, ... 317
Schaff, Prof., . . . 304
Shepherd, ... 309
Smyth, Dr. Th., . . 269
Sparks, Jared, . . . 251
Stanley, Dean, . . . 336
Stevens, Abel, . . . 242
Stillingfleet, . . . 257
Synopsis, Theo., . . 325
Synesius, ... 293
Smalcald, Art. of, . . 323

V.

Vandalin, ... 325

W.

Walter, ... 312
Welch, Prof., . . 333-7
Wesley, ... 242
Whitgift, ... 315
Whittaker on Jerome, 251, 313

William Jessup University
Paul Nystrom Library
333 Sunset Blvd.
Rocklin, CA. 95765

William Jessup University
Paul Nystrom Library
333 Sunset Blvd.
Rocklin, CA, 95765

SAN JOSE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE LIBRARY NF
262 G162t 1890
Gallagher, Mason
True historic episcopate : as seen in th
3 SJCC 00009 9970

SAN JOSE BIBLE CO
790 S. 12th St.
San Jose, Calif

DATE DUE

OCT 28 '69

Demco No. 62-0549